arXiv:1608.03760v2 [math.AG] 19 Aug 2016

NODAL CURVES WITH A CONTACT-CONIC AND ZARISKI PAIRS

SHINZO BANNAI AND TAKETO SHIRANE

Abstract. In this present paper, we study the splitting of nodal plane curves with respect to contact conics. We define the notion of *splitting type* of such curves and show that it can be used as an invariant to distinguish the embedded topology of plane curves. We also give a criterion to determine the splitting type in terms of the configuration of the nodes and tangent points. As an application, we construct sextics and contact conics with prescribed splitting types, which give rise to new Zariski-triples.

1. Introduction

Let Γ be a irreducible curve on the complex projective plane $\mathbb{P}^2$, and let $\pi : X \to \mathbb{P}^2$ be a Galois cover branched along $\Delta \subset \mathbb{P}^2$. We call Γ a *splitting curve* with respect to π if the pull back $\pi^*\Gamma$ of Γ is reducible. Splitting curves have been studied by various mathematicians. For example, E. Artal-Bartolo and Tokunaga studied the splitting of nodal rational curves with respect to a double cover branched along a smooth conic in [4]; I. Shimada studied the splitting of smooth conics with respect to a double cover branched along a sextic curve in [13]; the first author studied the splitting type of pairs of smooth curves of degree up to three with respect to a double cover branched along nodal quartics in [5]; and the second author studied the splitting number of a smooth curve for a simple cyclic cover branched along a smooth curve in [14]. In the papers listed above, the splitting of rational curves and smooth curves is intensively studied. However, it seems that there were few studies of the splitting of non-rational singular curve. For example, Tokunaga studied the splitting of nodal quartic curves in [16, 17]. In this paper, we investigate the splitting type of non-rational nodal curves with respect to a double cover branched along a smooth conic. More precisely, following the study of [4], we define the splitting type of a plane curve with respect to a smooth conic.

One of the motivation of study of the splitting curves is its application to Zariski k-plets, where a *Zariski k-plet* is a k-plet $(C_1, \ldots, C_k)$ of plane curves $C_1, \ldots, C_k \subset \mathbb{P}^2$ satisfying the following two conditions;

(i) there exist tubular neighborhoods $\mathcal{T}_i$ of C_i for $i = 1, \ldots, k$ such that the k topological pairs $(\mathcal{T}_i, C_i)$ are homeomorphic;
(ii) the topological pairs $(\mathbb{P}^2, C_i)$ and $(\mathbb{P}^2, C_j)$ are not homeomorphic if $i \neq j$.

We call a Zariski 2-plet a *Zariski pair*. It is known that, for a plane curve C and its tubular neighborhood $\mathcal{T}$, the homeomorphism class of $(\mathcal{T}, C)$ is determined by the combinatorial type of C, where the combinatorial type of Γ is data of number of its irreducible components, degree and singularities of each component, configuration

2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 14E20, 14H50, 32S50, 57N35.
Key words and phrases. splitting curve, Zariski pair, double cover.

of the components (see [3] for detail). There are may results about Zariski pairs by using some topological invariants of plane curves (cf. [1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 7, 8, 9, 12, 13, 14, 18]). A basic invariant is the fundamental group of the complement of a plane curve (cf. [1, 3, 4, 12, 18]). Recently, Zariski pairs which can not be distinguished by the fundamental group were found (cf. [3, 8, 14]). We call such a Zariski pair a π_1-*equivalent Zariski pair*. In particular, the result of [14] shows that study of the splitting curves allow us to construct π_1-equivalent Zariski pairs. In this paper, we prove that our splitting type is a topological invariant, and can be used to distinguish topology of plane curves.

The main theorem of this paper is a criterion for determining the splitting type of a nodal curve with respect to a smooth conic in terms of the configuration of the nodes and tangent points of the nodal curve and the smooth conic (Theorem 2.4). However, for a given splitting type, it is difficult to explicitly construct nodal curves with a contact conic which have the splitting type, especially when the nodes and tangent points need to be in general position. In order to construct various examples of nodal sextic curves with a contact conic, we prove that there exists a correspondence between nodal sextic curves on $\mathbb{P}^2$ with a contact conic and quartic surfaces in $\mathbb{P}^3$ with a node, where a node of a surface means an A_1-singularity.

Nodal quartic surfaces have been studied classically. In [11], a classification of nodal quartic surfaces was given. Also in [6], quartic surfaces with 8-nodes were studied from a different perspective. An 8-nodal quartic surface is called *syzygetic* if the quartic surface is defined by a quadratic form of quadratic forms, otherwise it is call *asyzygetic* (see Definition 4.9 for details). It is known that the geometric difference of syzygetic and asyzygetic quartic surface lie in the configuration of their nodes. In this paper, we prove that a syzygetic quartic surface and an asyzygetic quartic surface give two sextic curves with contact conics in the correspondence mentioned above, which have different splitting types. Moreover, we improve our criterion for splitting types of 7-nodal sextic curves by difference of syzygetic and asyzygetic quartic surfaces (Theorem 5.3).

This paper is organized as follows:

In Section 2, we define the splitting type of plane curves with respect to a smooth conic, and give a criterion for determining the splitting type in terms of the position of singularities. In Section 3, we give a correspondence between quartic surfaces with a node and sextic curves with a contact conic. In Section 4, we recall the geometric difference of syzygetic and asyzygetic quartic surfaces in detail in order to improve the criterion in Section 2 for 7-nodal sextic curves with a contact conic. In Section 5, we improve the criterion in Section 2 for 7-nodal sextic curves. In the final section, we give new examples of Zariski pairs consisting of 6 and 7-nodal sextic curves with a contact conic.

2. Splitting curves with respect to contact conics

The aim of this section is to prove Theorem 2.4 below. To state Theorem 2.4, we define some notion.

Definition 2.1. Let Γ be a curve. We call Γ a *nodal curve* if all of the singular points of Γ are nodes. Moreover, for a positive integer r, we call a nodal curve Γ an *r-nodal curve* if the number of nodes of Γ is r. Note that we allow Γ to be reducible unless otherwise stated.

For two curves $\Gamma_1, \Gamma_2 \subset \mathbb{P}^2$ and a point $P \in \Gamma_1 \cap \Gamma_2$, the local intersection number of Γ_1 and Γ_2 at P is denoted by $\mathrm{I}_P(\Gamma_1, \Gamma_2)$. For a curve $\Delta \subset \mathbb{P}^2$ of degree $2d$, let $\pi_\Delta : X_\Delta \to \mathbb{P}^2$ denote the double cover branched along Δ, and let $\iota_\Delta : X_\Delta \to X_\Delta$ be the covering transformation of π_Δ. Note that, if Δ is a smooth conic, then $X_\Delta \cong \mathbb{P}^1 \times \mathbb{P}^1$ and ι_Δ interchanges the two rulings.

Definition 2.2. Let Γ be a curve on $\mathbb{P}^2$.

(i) A smooth conic $\Delta \subset \mathbb{P}^2$ is called a *contact conic of* Γ if all of the intersection points of Γ and Δ are smooth points of Γ, and $I_P(\Gamma, \Delta) \geq 2$ for all $P \in \Gamma \cap \Delta$. Furthermore, a contact conic $\Delta \subset \mathbb{P}^2$ of Γ is called an *even contact conic* (resp. a *simple contact conic*) of Γ if $I_P(\Gamma, \Delta)$ is even (resp. equal to two) for all $P \in \Gamma \cap \Delta$.

(ii) Let $\Gamma \subset \mathbb{P}^2$ be a curve with an even contact conic Δ. For two positive integers $m \leq n$, we call Γ a *splitting curve of type* (m, n) *with respect to* Δ if $\pi_\Delta^* \Gamma = D^+ + D^-$ for an (m, n)-divisor D^+ on $X_\Delta \cong \mathbb{P}^1 \times \mathbb{P}^1$, where $D^- = \iota_\Delta^* D^+$. We call Γ a *non-splitting curve with respect to* Δ if Γ is not a splitting curve of type (m, n) with respect to Δ for any $m \leq n$, or equivalently, $\pi_\Delta^* \Gamma_0$ is irreducible for some irreducible component Γ_0 of Γ.

Theorem 2.3. *For $i = 1, 2$, let $\Gamma_i \subset \mathbb{P}^2$ be an irreducible curve of degree $d \geq 3$ with a contact conic Δ_i. Assume that there exists a homeomorphism $h : \mathbb{P}^2 \to \mathbb{P}^2$ such that $h(\Gamma_1 + \Delta_1) = \Gamma_2 + \Delta_2$. Then Γ_1 is a splitting curve of type (m, n) with respect to Δ_1 if and only if Γ_2 is also a splitting curve of type (m, n) with respect to Δ_2.*

Proof. Since $\deg \Gamma_i = d \geq 3$, we have $h(\Gamma_1) = \Gamma_2$ and $h(\Delta_1) = \Delta_2$. Let $\bar{\Delta}_i \subset X_{\Delta_i}$ be the preimage of Δ_i for π_{Δ_i}. As in the proof of [5, Proposition 2.5], there exists a homeomorphism $\bar{h} : X_{\Delta_1} \setminus \bar{\Delta}_1 \to X_{\Delta_2} \setminus \bar{\Delta}_2$ such that $h \circ \pi_{\Delta_1} = \pi_{\Delta_2} \circ \bar{h}$ over $\mathbb{P}^2 \setminus \Delta_2$:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} X_{\Delta_1} \setminus \bar{\Delta}_1 & \xrightarrow{\bar{h}} & X_{\Delta_2} \setminus \bar{\Delta}_2 \\ \downarrow{\scriptstyle \pi_{\Delta_1}} & & \downarrow{\scriptstyle \pi_{\Delta_2}} \\ \mathbb{P}^2 \setminus \Delta_1 & \xrightarrow[h]{} & \mathbb{P}^2 \setminus \Delta_2 \end{array}$$

Suppose that Γ_1 is a splitting curve of type (m, n) with respect to Δ_1, say $\pi_{\Delta_1}^* \Gamma_1 = D_1^+ + D_1^-$ for a (m, n)-divisor D^+. Let D_2^+ and D_2^- be the closures of $\bar{h}(D_1^+ \setminus \bar{\Delta}_1)$ and $\bar{h}(D_1^- \setminus \bar{\Delta}_1)$, respectively. Then D_2^+ and D_2^- are irreducible components of $\pi_{\Delta_2}^* \Gamma_2$. Hence Γ_2 is a splitting curve with respect to Δ_2, say of type (m', n'). Since the local intersection number of D_i^+ and D_i^- at a point $\bar{P}$ of $\pi_{\Delta_i}^{-1}(\Delta_i \cap \Gamma_i)$ determines the intersection of Γ_i and Δ_i at $\pi(\bar{P})$, we obtain

$$m^2 + n^2 = D_1^+ . D_1^- = D_2^+ . D_2^- = m'^2 + n'^2.$$

Since $m + n = m' + n' = d$, $m \leq n$ and $m' \leq n'$, we obtain $m = m'$ and $n = n'$. $\square$

For curves Γ, Δ and a line L on $\mathbb{P}^2$, we let γ, δ and l be homogeneous polynomials which define Γ, Δ and L, respectively. For a real number $r \in \mathbb{R}$, the maximal integer not beyond r is denoted by $[r]$. In the following, we say that L is *a general line* (with respect to Γ) if L intersects Γ transversally.

Theorem 2.4. *Let m, n be two integers with $0 < m \leq n$, $d := m + n$, $k := n - m$, and $\alpha := (m^2 + n^2 - m - n)/2$. Let $\Gamma \subset \mathbb{P}^2$ be a nodal curve of degree d with a simple contact conic Δ. Let $T_1, \dots, T_d$ be the tangent points of Γ and Δ.*

Then the following three conditions are equivalent:

(i) *Γ is a splitting curve of type (m, n) with respect to Δ;*

(ii) *for any general line L tangent to Δ, there exist $c_i \in H^0(\mathbb{P}^2, \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^2}(i))$ for $i = n-1, n$ satisfying the following conditions:*
   (ii-a) *c_n and c_{n-1} have no common factor with l, and*
   (ii-b) *$\gamma\, l^k = c_n^2 - \delta\, c_{n-1}^2$;*

(iii) *for a general line L tangent to Δ, there exist $c_i \in H^0(\mathbb{P}^2, \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^2}(i))$ for $i = n-1, n$ satisfying the conditions (ii-a) and (ii-b) above;*

(iv) *for any general line L tangent to Δ at $T_0 \in \Delta$, there are α nodes $P_1, \dots, P_\alpha \in \Gamma$ of Γ, m intersection points $Q_1, \dots, Q_m \in \Gamma \cap L$ of Γ and L, and two divisors C_n and C_{n-1} on $\mathbb{P}^2$ of degree n and $n-1$ respectively satisfying the following conditions;*
   (iv-a) *both C_n and C_{n-1} pass through the nodes $P_1, \dots, P_\alpha$, and C_n passes through the tangent points $T_1, \dots, T_d \in \Gamma \cap \Delta$;*
   (iv-b) *C_j is smooth at Q_i, and $\mathrm{I}_{Q_i}(C_j, \Gamma) = k$ for each $i = 1, \dots, m$ and $j = n-1, n$;*
   (iv-c) *C_n has $[k/2] + (1 - (-1)^k)/2$ local branches at T_0, and $[k/2]$ of the local branches are tangent to Δ;*
   (iv-d) *C_{n-1} has $[(k-1)/2] + (1 - (-1)^{k-1})/2$ local branches at T_0, and $[(k-1)/2]$ of the local branches are them tangent to Δ;*
   (iv-e) *any two of the five divisors Γ, Δ, L, C_n and C_{n-1} have no common components;*

(v) *for a general line L tangent to Δ at $T_0 \in \Delta$, there are α nodes $P_1, \dots, P_\alpha \in \Gamma$ of Γ, m intersection points $Q_1, \dots, Q_m \in \Gamma \cap L$ of Γ and L, and two divisors C_n and C_{n-1} on $\mathbb{P}^2$ of degree n and $n-1$ respectively satisfying the conditions in (iv-a), …, (iv-e) above;*

Proof. We first prove the equivalence of the conditions (i), (ii) and (iii). Assume that $\pi_\Delta^* \Gamma = D^+ + D^-$ for some (m, n)-divisor D^+ on $\mathbb{P}^1 \times \mathbb{P}^1$ and $D^- := \iota_\Delta^* D^+$. Let L be a general tangent line of Δ. Since L is a rational curve and tangent to Δ, $\pi_\Delta^* L = L^+ + L^-$ for some $(1, 0)$-divisor L^+ and $L^- := \iota_\Delta^* L^+$. Hence $\Gamma + k\, L$ is split into two (n, n)-divisors by π_Δ, i.e.

$$\pi_\Delta^*(\Gamma + k\, L) = (D^+ + k\, L^+) + (D^- + k\, L^-).$$

Let $\tilde{d}^+ = 0$ be a defining equation of the (n, n)-divisor $D^+ + k\, L^+$, and $\tilde{d}^- = \iota_\Delta^* \tilde{d}^+$. Since $\tilde{d}^+ + \tilde{d}^-$ is invariant under ι_Δ^*, there exists $c_n \in H^0(\mathbb{P}^2, \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^2}(n))$ such that $\pi_\Delta^* c_n = \tilde{d}^+ + \tilde{d}^-$. Let $R \subset \mathbb{P}^1 \times \mathbb{P}^1$ be the ramification locus of π_Δ, and let $r = 0$ be the defining equation of R. Since $\tilde{d}^+ - \tilde{d}^- = 0$ along R, $\tilde{d}^+ - \tilde{d}^-$ is divided by r. Moreover, since $\iota_\Delta^* r = -r$, $(\tilde{d}^+ - \tilde{d}^-)/r$ is invariant under ι_Δ^*. Thus there is $c_{n-1} \in H^0(\mathbb{P}^2, \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^2}(n-1))$ such that $\pi_\Delta^* c_{n-1} = (\tilde{d}^+ - \tilde{d}^-)/r$. Since $\pi_\Delta^*(\Gamma + k\, L)$ is defined by $\pi_\Delta^*(c_n^2 - \delta\, c_{n-1}^2) = 0$, condition (ii) holds.

It is trivial that condition (ii) implies condition (iii). Now, assume that condition (iii) holds. Then we have $\pi_\Delta^*(\Gamma + k\, L) = \widetilde{D}^+ + \widetilde{D}^-$, where $\widetilde{D}^\pm$ are the (n, n)-divisors on $\mathbb{P}^1 \times \mathbb{P}^1$ defined by $\pi_\Delta^* c_n \pm r\, \pi_\Delta^* c_{n-1} = 0$. By condition (ii-a), $\pi_\Delta^* c_n \pm r\, \pi_\Delta^* c_{n-1}$ are not divided by $\pi_\Delta^* l$ since $\pi_\Delta^* c_n - r\, \pi_\Delta^* c_{n-1} = \iota_\Delta^*(\pi_\Delta^* c_n + r\, \pi_\Delta^* c_{n-1})$ and $\iota_\Delta^* \pi_\Delta^* l = \pi_\Delta^* l$.

Since Γ and $\pi_\Delta^*\Gamma$ are reduced, $\widetilde{D}^\pm = D^\pm + k\,L^\pm$ for some (m,n)-divisor D^+ and $D^- = \iota_\Delta^* D^+$. Therefore we obtain $\pi_\Delta^*\Gamma = D^+ + D^-$, and conditions (i), (ii) and (iii) are equivalent.

Next we prove that condition (i) implies condition (iv). Suppose that $\pi_\Delta^*\Gamma = D^+ + D^-$ for an (m,n)-divisor D^+ and $D^- := \iota_\Delta^* D^+$, and let L be a general tangent line of Δ. Since the intersection number $D^+.D^-$ is equal to m^2+n^2, and $D^+ \cap D^- \cap R = \pi_\Delta^{-1}(\Gamma \cap \Delta)$ consists of $d = m+n$ points, there are α nodes of Γ, $P_1, \ldots, P_\alpha$, such that

$$\{P_1, \ldots, P_\alpha, T_1, \ldots, T_d\} = \pi_\Delta(D^+ \cap D^-).$$

Since $L^+.D^- = m$, there are $Q_1, \ldots, Q_m \in \Gamma$ such that

$$\{Q_1, \ldots, Q_m\} = \pi_\Delta(L^+ \cap D^-).$$

By (ii), we have $\gamma\, l^k = c_n^2 - \delta\, c_{n-1}^2$. Let C_n and C_{n-1} be the divisors on $\mathbb{P}^2$ given by $c_n = 0$ and $c_{n-1} = 0$, respectively. We prove that P_i, Q_j, C_n and C_{n-1} satisfy (iv-a), …, (iv-e).

As in the above argument, $\tilde{d}^\pm = \pi_\Delta^* c_n \pm r\,\pi_\Delta^* c_{n-1} = 0$ define $D^\pm + k\,L^\pm$, respectively. This implies that $\pi_\Delta^* c_n$ and $r\,\pi_\Delta^* c_{n-1}$ vanish at $(D^+ + L^+) \cap (D^- + L^-)$. Hence C_n (resp. C_{n-1}) passes through $\pi_\Delta(D^+ \cap D^-)$ (resp. $P_1, \ldots, P_\alpha$). Thus C_n and C_{n-1} satisfy the condition (iv-a).

At an intersection $P \in D^+ \cap L^-$, we can write locally $\tilde{d}^+ = s$ and $\tilde{d}^- = t^k$ since L intersects transversally with Γ, where s and t are generators of the maximal ideal $\mathfrak{m}_P$ at P. Hence $\pi_\Delta^* C_n$ and $\pi_\Delta^* C_{n-1}$ are defined by $s + t^k = 0$ and $s - t^k = 0$ respectively. Since $P \in \mathbb{P}^1 \times \mathbb{P}^1$ is an unramified point of π_Δ, C_n and C_{n-1} satisfies condition (iv-b).

At the intersection P of L^+ and L^-, we can write locally $\tilde{d}^+ = s^k$ and $\tilde{d}^- = t^k$. Therefore, we have

$$\tilde{d}^+ + \tilde{d}^- = \begin{cases} (s+t) \displaystyle\prod_{i=1}^{(k-1)/2} (s^2 - (\zeta_{2k}^{2i-1} + \zeta_{2k}^{2k-2i+1})\, s\, t + t^2) & \text{if } k \text{ is odd} \\ \displaystyle\prod_{i=1}^{k/2} (s^2 - (\zeta_{2k}^{2i-1} + \zeta_{2k}^{2k-2i+1})\, s\, t + t^2) & \text{if } k \text{ is even,} \end{cases}$$

$$\tilde{d}^+ - \tilde{d}^- = \begin{cases} (s-t) \displaystyle\prod_{i=1}^{(k-1)/2} (s^2 - (\zeta_k^{i} + \zeta_k^{k-i})\, s\, t + t^2) & \text{if } k \text{ is odd} \\ (s-t)(s+t) \displaystyle\prod_{i=1}^{(k-2)/2} (s^2 - (\zeta_k^{i} + \zeta_k^{k-i})\, s\, t + t^2) & \text{if } k \text{ is even,} \end{cases}$$

where ζ_k is a primitive kth root of unity. Since $s - t = 0$ defines R at P, conditions (iv-c) and (iv-d) in the assertion hold. It is clear that any two of $\tilde{d}^+$, r, l^-, $\tilde{d}^+ + \tilde{d}^-$ and $(\tilde{d}^+ - \tilde{d}^-)/r$ have no common factors, where $l^- = 0$ is a defining equation of L^-. Therefore condition (iv-e) in the assertion holds. Hence condition (i) implies condition (iv).

It is trivial that condition (iv) implies condition (v). Finally, we prove that condition (v) implies condition (iii). We assume that there exist α nodes $P_1, \ldots, P_\alpha \in \Gamma$, m intersection points $Q_1, \ldots, Q_m \in \Gamma \cap L$ and two divisors $C_n, C_{n-1} \subset \mathbb{P}^2$ satisfying conditions (iv-a), …, (iv-e). Let γ, δ, l, c_n and c_{n-1} be homogeneous polynomials defining Γ, Δ, L, C_n and C_{n-1}, respectively. Let Λ be the linear system generated

by three divisors $D_1 := \Gamma + k\,L$, $D_2 := 2\,C_n$ and $D_3 := 2\,C_{n-1} + \Delta$. It is sufficient to prove $\dim \Lambda = 1$. We seek the base points of Λ in order to resolve the indeterminacy locus of the rational map $\Phi_\Lambda : \mathbb{P}^2 \dashrightarrow \mathbb{P}^N$ ($N = \dim \Lambda$) given by Λ. Note that, by condition (iv-e), the number of base points of Λ is finite. From conditions (iv-a) and (iv-b),

$$\begin{aligned}\Gamma.C_n &\geq \sum_{i=1}^{\alpha} \mathrm{I}_{P_i}(\Gamma, C_n) + \sum_{i=1}^{m} \mathrm{I}_{Q_i}(\Gamma, C_n) + \sum_{i=1}^{d} \mathrm{I}_{T_i}(\Gamma, C_n)\\ &\geq 2\,\alpha + m\,k + d\\ &= n(m+n).\end{aligned}$$

Hence we have $\Gamma \cap C_n = \{P_1, \dots, P_\alpha, Q_1, \dots, Q_m, T_1, \dots, T_d\}$, $\mathrm{I}_{P_i}(\Gamma, C_n) = 2$ ($1 \leq i \leq \alpha$) and $\mathrm{I}_{T_i}(\Gamma, C_n) = 1$ ($1 \leq i \leq d$). Moreover, C_n is smooth at P_i ($1 \leq i \leq \alpha$) and T_i ($1 \leq i \leq d$). By the same argument, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\Gamma \cap C_{n-1} &= \{P_1, \dots, P_\alpha, Q_1, \dots, Q_m\},\\ L \cap C_n &= L \cap C_{n-1} = \{Q_1, \dots, Q_m, T_0\},\\ \Delta \cap C_n &= \{T_0, T_1, \dots, T_d\},\\ C_n \cap C_{n-1} &= \{P_1, \dots, P_\alpha, Q_1, \dots, Q_m, T_0\}.\end{aligned}$$

Thus we obtain $D_i \cap D_j = \{P_1, \dots, P_\alpha, Q_1, \dots, Q_m, T_0, \dots, T_d\}$ for $1 \leq i < j \leq 3$. Moreover, the following conditions hold;

- (P_i) local branches of Γ, C_n and C_{n-1} at P_i are smooth, and intersect transversally with each other;
- (Q_i) Γ, C_n and C_{n-1} intersect each other at Q_i with multiplicity k;
- (T_0) local branches of C_n and C_{n-1} at T_0 are smooth, and L, Δ and local branches of C_j ($j = n, n-1$) at T_0 intersect each other with multiplicity at most 2;
- (T_i) Γ and C_n intersect transversally at T_i ($1 \leq i \leq d$).

We resolve the indeterminacy locus of Φ_Λ through blowing-ups. For a blowing-up $\sigma : \widetilde{X} \to X$, by abuse of notation, we use the same symbol D for a divisor D on X to describe the pull back $\sigma^* D$. Let $\sigma_{P_i} : X_{P_i} \to \mathbb{P}^2$ be the blowing-up at $P_i \in \mathbb{P}^2$, and E_{P_i} the exceptional divisor of σ_{P_i}. Since $m_{P_i}(D_j) = 2$ for $i = 1, 2, 3$, the divisors $D_j - 2\,E_{P_i}$ on X_{P_i} have no intersection with each other over P_i.

Let $\sigma_{T_0,1} : X_{T_0,1} \to \mathbb{P}^2$ be the blowing-up at $T_0 \in \mathbb{P}^2$, and $E_{T_0,1}$ the exceptional divisor of $\sigma_{T_0,1}$. From conditions (iv-c), (iv-d) and (T_0), $D_j - k\,E_{T_0,1} \subset X_{T_0,1}$ ($j = 1, 2, 3$) intersect at one point, say $T_{0,1}$, and the local branches of $D_j - k\,E_{T_0,1}$ at $T_{0,1}$ intersect transversally with each other. Let $\sigma_{T_0,2} : X_{T_0,2} \to X_{T_0,1}$ be the blowing-up at $T_{0,1} \in X_{T_0,1}$, and $E_{T_0,2}$ the exceptional divisor of $\sigma_{T_0,2}$. Then the divisors $D_j - k\,E_{T_0,1} - k\,E_{T_0,2} \subset X_{T_0,2}$ ($j = 1, 2, 3$) do not intersect each other over T_0.

Let $\sigma_{Q_i,1} : X_{Q_i,1} \to \mathbb{P}^2$ be the blowing-up at $Q_i \in \mathbb{P}^2$, and let $E_{Q_i,1}$ be the exceptional divisor of $\sigma_{Q_i,1}$. By condition (iv-b), we have

$$\mathrm{I}_{Q_i}(D_j, D_{j'}) = k+1 \ (j \neq j'), \quad m_{Q_i}(D_1) = k, \quad m_{Q_i}(D_j) = 2 \ (j = 2, 3).$$

From conditions (iv-b) and (Q_i), the divisors $D_j - 2\,E_{Q_i,1}$ on $X_{Q_i,1}$ intersect at one point, say $Q_{i,1}$. Moreover, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathrm{I}_{Q_{i,1}}(D_j - 2\,E_{Q_i,1}, D_{j'} - 2\,E_{Q_i,1}) &= k-1, \\ m_{Q_{i,1}}(D_1 - 2\,E_{Q_i,1}) &= k, \\ m_{Q_{i,1}}(D_j - 2\,E_{Q_i,1}) &= 2 \qquad (j=2,3). \end{aligned}$$

Similarly, let $\sigma_{Q_i,j} : X_{Q_i,j} \to X_{Q_i,j-1}$ $(j = 2,\dots,k)$ be such blowing-ups over Q_i, and let $E_{Q_i,j}$ be the exceptional divisors of $\sigma_{Q_i,j}$. Then the three divisors $D_j - \sum_{j=1}^{k} 2\,E_{Q_i,j}$ do not intersect each other over Q_i.

Let $\sigma_{T_i,1} : X_{T_i,1} \to \mathbb{P}^2$ be the blowing-up at $T_i \in \mathbb{P}^2$ for $1 \le i \le d$, and let $E_{T_i,1}$ be the exceptional divisor of $\sigma_{T_i,1}$. By condition (T_i), $D_j - E_{T_i,1}$ $(j = 1,2,3)$ intersect at one points, say $T_{i,1}$, and intersect transversally with each other. Let $\sigma_{T_i,2} : X_{T_i,2} \to X_{T_i,1}$ be the blowing-up at $T_{i,1}$, and let $E_{T_i,2}$ be the exceptional divisor of $\sigma_{T_i,2}$. Then $D_j - E_{T_i,1} - E_{T_i}$ $(j = 1,2,3)$ do not intersect each other over T_i.

Let $\sigma : \widetilde{X} \to \mathbb{P}^2$ be the composition of blowing-ups σ_{P_i}, $\sigma_{Q_i,j}$ $(j = 1,\dots,k)$, $\sigma_{T_0,j}$ $(j = 1,2)$, $\sigma_{T_i,j}$ $(j = 1,2)$, and

$$\widetilde{D}_j := D_j - \sum_{i=1}^{\alpha} 2\,E_{P_i} - \sum_{i=1}^{m}\sum_{j'=1}^{k} 2\,E_{Q_i,j'} - k\,(E_{T_0,1} + E_{T_0,2}) - \sum_{i=1}^{d}(E_{T_i,1} + E_{T_i,2}).$$

Put $\widetilde{\Lambda}$ as the linear system on $\widetilde{X}$ generated by $\widetilde{D}_j$ $(j = 1,2,3)$. Then the self-intersection number of $\widetilde{D}_j$ is equal to 0, $\widetilde{D}_j^2 = 0$. Hence we have $\dim \mathrm{Im}(\Phi_{\widetilde{\Lambda}}) = 1$. Moreover, since $\widetilde{D}_j.E_{T_i,2} = 1$ for $j = 1,\dots,d$, we have $\deg \Phi_{\widetilde{\Lambda}}(\widetilde{D}_j) = 1$. Therefore $\dim \Lambda = \dim \widetilde{\Lambda} = 1$. □

From Theorem 2.4, we have the following corollary.

Corollary 2.5. *Let Γ be a r-nodal curve of degree d with a simple contact conic Δ. If Γ is a splitting curve of type (m,n) with respect to Δ, then $2\,r \ge m^2 + n^2 - d$.*

Theorem 2.4 enables us to determine the splitting type of a given curve Γ with respect to a simple contact conic Δ by geometrical conditions (iv-a), …, (iv-e). However, the conditions (iv-b), (iv-c), (iv-d) seems complicated.

The corollary below is useful to prove that a curve Γ is not a splitting curve of type (m,n) with respect to a simple contact conic Δ. We prepare some terminology used in the statement. Let X be a nonsingular variety, $P_1,\dots,P_r \in X$ be distinct r points of X and $D \subset X$ be a divisor of X. We denote the linear system consisting of effective divisors of $|D|$ through $P_1,\dots,P_r$ by $|D - P_1 - \cdots - P_r|$. The points $P_1,\dots,P_r$ are called the *assigned base points* of $\mathfrak{d} := |D - P_1 - \cdots - P_r|$. Let $\sigma : \widetilde{X} \to X$ be the blowing-up at $P_1,\dots,P_r$, and $E_1,\dots,E_r$ the exceptional divisors of σ. We call base points of $|\sigma^* D - E_1 - \cdots - E_r|$, considered as infinitely near points of X, *unassigned base points* of $\mathfrak{d}$.

Corollary 2.6. *Let Γ be a nodal curve of degree d with a simple contact conic Δ, and let $T_1,\dots,T_d$ be tangent points of Γ and Δ. Assume that Γ is a splitting curve of type (m,n) with respect to Δ. Put $\alpha = (m^2 + n^2 - m - n)/2$. Then there are α nodes of Γ, $P_1,\dots,P_\alpha$, such that $\mathfrak{d} := |n\,L - P_1 - \cdots - P_\alpha - T_1 - \cdots - T_d|$ has no unassigned base points, and $\dim \mathfrak{d} \ge n - m$, where L is a line on $\mathbb{P}^2$.*

Proof. By the assumption, $\pi_\Delta^*\Gamma = D^+ + D^-$ for some (m,n)-divisor D^+ and $D^- = \iota_\Delta^* D^+$. Let $k := n - m$ and $L_1, \dots, L_k$ be general lines tangent to Δ. Then $\widetilde{\Gamma} := \Gamma + L_1 + \cdots + L_k$ is a splitting curve of type (n,n) with respect to Δ. By Theorem 2.4, there exist $n^2 - n$ nodes of $\widetilde{\Gamma}$, $P_1, \dots, P_{n^2-n}$, and a divisor C_n of degree n which has no common components with Δ and passes through $P_1, \dots, P_{n^2-n}$ and all tangent points of $\widetilde{\Gamma}$ and Δ. As in the proof of Theorem 2.4, we may assume that $\{P_1, \dots, P_\alpha\} = \pi_\Delta(D^+ \cap D^-) \subset \Gamma$. Hence $P_1, \dots, P_\alpha$ are independent of the choice of $L_1, \dots, L_k$. Thus the generality of $L_1, \dots, L_k$ implies that $\dim |n\,L - P_1 - \cdots - P_\alpha - T_1 - \cdots - T_d| \geq k = n - m$.

Let $P \in \mathbb{P}^2 \setminus \{P_1, \dots, P_\alpha\}$ be a point not on Δ. Let L_0 be a tangent line of Δ through P. Put $\pi_\Delta^* L_0 = L_0^+ + L_0^-$, where L_0^+ is a $(1,0)$-curve and $L_0^- = \iota_\Delta^* L_0^+$, and put $d^\pm = 0$ and $l_0^\pm = 0$ as defining equations of $D^\pm$ and $L_0^\pm$, respectively. If $P \in \Gamma$ and $\pi^{-1}(P) = \{P^+, P^-\}$ with $P^+ \in D^+$ and $P^- \in D^-$, then we can choose L_0 such that $P^+ \notin L_0^-$ and $P^- \notin L_0^+$. Then the curve C_n of degree n on $\mathbb{P}^2$ such that $\pi_\Delta^* C_n$ is defined by $(l_0^+)^k\, d^+ + (l_0^-)^k\, d^- = 0$ passes through $P_1, \dots, P_\alpha, T_1, \dots, T_d$, but not P. Hence $\mathfrak{d}$ has no unassigned base points. □

3. Quartic surfaces and sextic curves with a contact conic

In this section, we prove that there exists a surjection from the set of normal quartic surfaces in $\mathbb{P}^3$ with a node (i.e. and A_1-type singularity) at a point $P \in \mathbb{P}^3$, which contain no lines through P, to the set of sextic curves on $\mathbb{P}^2$ with an even contact conic (Theorem 3.3). We will apply this result to prove a simple criterion for a nodal sextic curve with a contact conic to be a splitting curve of type $(2,4)$ in Section 4. In order to prove Theorem 3.3, we consider a birational map between $\mathbb{P}^1$-bundles over $\mathbb{P}^2$ given by Sumihiro [15].

For $i \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 1}$, we put $\mathcal{E}_i := \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^2} \oplus \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^2}(-i)$. Let $\varphi_i : \mathcal{P}_i \to \mathbb{P}^2$ be the $\mathbb{P}^1$-bundle with $\mathcal{P}_i := \mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{P}^2}(\mathcal{E}_i)$, and let $\mathcal{L}_i$ be the tautological bundle on $\mathcal{P}_i$ with $\varphi_{i*}\mathcal{L}_i \cong \mathcal{E}_i$. Let $(x_0 : x_1 : x_2)$ be homogeneous coordinates of $\mathbb{P}^2$, and let U_j be the affine open subset of $\mathbb{P}^2$ given by $x_j \neq 0$ for $j = 0, 1, 2$. Let $x_{j,0}$ and $x_{j,i}$ denote the local basis of $\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^2}$ and $\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^2}(-i)$ on U_j for $j = 0, 1, 2$, respectively. By abuse of notation, we regard $(x_{j,0} : x_{j,i})$ as homogeneous coordinates of the fibers of φ_i over U_j. Let A_j denote the coordinate ring $H^0(U_j, \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^2}|_{U_j})$ of U_j. We prove the following lemma by the same argument of [10, V Proposition 2.6].

Lemma 3.1. *If $S \subset \mathcal{P}_i$ is a section of φ_i, then $\mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{P}_i}(S)$ is isomorphic to either $\mathcal{L}_i$ or $\mathcal{L}_i \otimes \varphi_i^*\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^2}(i)$. Moreover, if $\mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{P}_i}(S) \cong \mathcal{L}_i$, then S is defined by $x_{j,0} = 0$ over U_j for $j = 0, 1, 2$; and if $\mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{P}_i}(S) \cong \mathcal{L}_i \otimes \varphi_i^*\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^2}(i)$, then S satisfies one of the following conditions;*

(i) *S is defined by $x_{j,i} = 0$ over U_j;*
(ii) *there exists an effective divisor D_S of degree i on $\mathbb{P}^2$ such that S is defined by $g_j\, x_{j,0} - x_{j,i} = 0$ over U_j, where $g_j = 0$ is a defining equation of D_S over U_j.*

In particular, a section $S_{i,0}$ of φ_i satisfying $\mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{P}_i}(S_{i,0}) \cong \mathcal{L}_i$ is uniquely determined.

Proof. By [10, II Proposition 7.12], a section $s : \mathbb{P}^2 \to \mathcal{P}_i$ of φ_i corresponds to a surjection $\eta : \mathcal{E}_i \to \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^2}(k)$ for some $k \in \mathbb{Z}$, and we have $s^*\mathcal{L}_i \cong \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^2}(k)$. The kernel of η gives the ideal sheaf of the image of s since a surjection $\eta : \mathcal{E}_i \to \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^2}(k)$ induces a surjection $S(\eta) : S(\mathcal{E}_i) \to S(\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^2}(k))$ which defines $s : \mathbb{P}^2 \to \mathcal{P}_i$, where $S(\bullet)$ denotes the symmetric algebra of a vector bundle $\bullet$. A homomorphism η :

$\mathcal{E}_i \to \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^2}(k)$ corresponds to a piar (η_0, η_i), where η_0 and η_i are global sections of $\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^2}(k)$ and $\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^2}(k+i)$, respectively. In particular, η is zero at $\eta_0 = \eta_i = 0$. Hence, if η is surjective, then $k = -i$ or $k = 0$.

Let $s : \mathbb{P}^2 \to \mathcal{P}_i$ be a section of φ_i given by a surjection $\eta : \mathcal{E}_i \to \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^2}(k)$, and let $S \subset \mathcal{P}_i$ be the image of s. We consider the exact sequence

$$0 \to \mathcal{L}_i \otimes \mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{P}_i}(-S) \to \mathcal{L}_i \to \mathcal{L}_i \otimes \mathcal{O}_S \to 0.$$

Taking φ_{i*}, we have the following exact sequence

$$0 \to \varphi_{i*}(\mathcal{L}_i \otimes \mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{P}_i}(-S)) \to \mathcal{E}_i \to \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^2}(k) \to 0 \tag{1}$$

with 0 on the right because $R^1\varphi_{i*}(\mathcal{L}_i \otimes \mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{P}_i}(-S)) = 0$ (cf. [10, V Lemma 2.4]). Since the degree of $\mathcal{L}_i \otimes \mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{P}_i}(-S)$ along fibers is 0, $\varphi_{i*}(\mathcal{L}_i \otimes \mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{P}_i}(-S))$ is invertible by [10, III Corollary 12.9]. Moreover, we obtain

$$\mathcal{L}_i \otimes \mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{P}_i}(-S) \cong \varphi_i^*\varphi_{i*}(\mathcal{L}_i \otimes \mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{P}_i}(-S)).$$

If $k = -i$, then the exact sequence (1) implies $\varphi_{i*}(\mathcal{L}_i \otimes \mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{P}_i}(-S)) \cong \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^2}$. Thus $\mathcal{L}_i \cong \mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{P}_i}(S)$. Moreover, since η corresponds to $(0, \eta_i)$ for some $\eta_i \in \mathbb{C}^\times$, the kernel of η is locally generated by $x_{j,0}$ on U_j. Hence the section S is locally defined by $x_{j,0} = 0$ over U_j.

If $k = 0$, then the exact sequence (1) implies $\varphi_{i*}(\mathcal{L}_i \otimes \mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{P}_i}(-S)) \cong \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^2}(-i)$. Therefore, $\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}_i}(S) \cong \mathcal{L}_i \otimes \varphi_i^*\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^2}(i)$. Suppose η corresponds to (η_0, η_i) for $\eta_k \in H^0(\mathbb{P}^2, \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^2}(k))$, then $\eta_0 \in \mathbb{C}^\times$ since η is surjective. If $\eta_i = 0$, then $\eta|_{U_j} : A_j\, x_{j,0} \oplus A_j\, x_{j,i} \to A_j$ is given by $x_{j,0} \mapsto \eta_0$ and $x_{j,i} \mapsto 0$; hence S is locally defined by $x_{j,i} = 0$ over U_j. Suppose that $\eta_i \neq 0$. Let D_S be the effective divisor on $\mathbb{P}^2$ corresponding to $\eta_i \in H^0(\mathbb{P}^2, \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^2}(i))$. In this case, the image of the second factor $\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^2}(-i)$ of $\mathcal{E}_i$ by η is the ideal sheaf of D_S. Thus η is locally given by $x_{j,0} \mapsto \eta_0$ and $x_{j,i} \mapsto \eta_0\, g_j$ over U_j, where $g_j = 0$ is a defining equation of D_S on U_j. Therefore S is defined by $g_j\, x_{j,0} - x_{j,i} = 0$ over U_j. □

Let $C_d \subset \mathbb{P}^2$ be a reduced curve of degree d locally defined by $f_j = 0$ on U_j. Let $Y_{i,d} \subset \mathcal{P}_i$ denote the closed subscheme $S_{i,0} \cap \varphi_i^* C_d$, and let $\sigma_{i,d} : V_{i,d} \to \mathcal{P}_i$ be the blowing-up along $Y_{i,d}$. Put $E_{i,d}$ as the exceptional divisor of $\sigma_{i,d}$. By elementary transformations of vector bundles [15, (1.5) Theorem], the divisor $(\varphi_i \circ \sigma_{i,d})^* C_d - E_{i,d}$ is contractible. Let $\sigma'_{i,d} : V_{i,d} \to \mathcal{P}'_{i,d}$ be the contraction of $(\varphi_i \circ \sigma_{i,d})^* C_d - E_{i,d}$. By [15, (1.5) Theorem] again, there exists a $\mathbb{P}^1$-bundle structure $\varphi'_{i,d} : \mathcal{P}'_{i,d} \to \mathbb{P}^2$ with $\varphi_i \circ \sigma_{i,d} = \varphi'_{i,d} \circ \sigma'_{i,d}$. Hence we obtain the following commutative diagram:

(2)



Proposition 3.2. *The $\mathbb{P}^1$-bundle $\mathcal{P}'_{i,d}$ is isomorphic to $\mathcal{P}_{i+d}$, and $\varphi'_{i,d} : \mathcal{P}_{i,d} \to \mathbb{P}^2$ coincides with $\varphi_{i+d} : \mathcal{P}_{i+d} \to \mathbb{P}^2$. Moreover, the birational map $\theta_{i,d} = \sigma'_{i,d} \circ (\sigma_{i,d})^{-1} : \mathcal{P}_i \dashrightarrow \mathcal{P}'_{i,d} \cong \mathcal{P}_{i+d}$ is locally given by $\theta_{i,d}^*(x'_{j,0}) = x_{j,0}$ and $\theta_{i,d}^*(x'_{j,i+d}) = f_j\, x_{j,i}$ over U_j, where $x'_{j,0} = x_{j,0}$ and $x'_{j,i+d} = x_{j,i+d}$ are local basis of $\mathcal{E}_{i+d}$ over U_j.*

Proof. Since $S_{i,0}$ is defined by $x_{j,0} = 0$ over U_j, $Y_{i,d}$ is defined by $x_{j,0} = 0$ and $f_j\, x_{j,i} = 0$ over U_j for $j = 0, 1, 2$. By the proof of [15, (1.3) Lemma], $\mathcal{P}'_{i,d}$ is the $\mathbb{P}^1$-bundle associated with the vector bundle locally generated by $x'_{j,0} = x_{j,0}$ and $x'_{j,i+d} = f_j\, x_{j,i}$ on U_j. Since f_j is a local basis of the ideal sheaf $\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^2}(-d) \subset \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^2}$ of C_d over U_j, $x'_{j,0}$ and $x'_{j,i+d}$ form local basis of $\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^2}$ and $\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^2}(-i-d)$ on U_j, respectively. Hence $\mathcal{P}'_{i,d}$ is isomorphic to $\mathcal{P}_{i+d}$, and $\varphi'_{i,d}$ coincides with φ_{i+d}. Moreover, $x'_{j,0} = x_{j,0}$ and $x'_{j,i+d} = f_j\, x_{j,i}$ imply that $\theta^*_{i,d}(x'_{j,0}) = x_{j,0}$ and $\theta^*_{i,d}(x'_{j,i+d}) = f_j\, x_{j,i}$. □

Let $X \subset \mathbb{P}^3$ be a normal quartic surface with a node P not containing any lines through P, and let $p : \mathbb{P}^3 \dashrightarrow \mathbb{P}^2$ be the projection from P. Let $\phi : \widetilde{\mathbb{P}}^3 \to \mathbb{P}^3$ be the blowing-up of $\mathbb{P}^3$ at P, and let $\widetilde{X}$ be the strict transform of X by ϕ. The projection p induces a morphism $\tilde{p} : \widetilde{\mathbb{P}}^3 \to \mathbb{P}^2$. Note that $\widetilde{\mathbb{P}}^3$ is isomorphic to $\mathcal{P}_1$, and $\tilde{p}$ coincides with $\varphi_1 : \mathcal{P}_1 \to \mathbb{P}^2$. Let $\widetilde{X} \subset \mathcal{P}_1$ be the strict transformation of X by the blowing-up at P, and let $\pi_X : \widetilde{X} \to \mathbb{P}^2$ denote the restriction of φ_1 to $\widetilde{X}$. Since X contains no lines through P, π_X is a double cover over $\mathbb{P}^2$. Let $\Gamma_X \subset \mathbb{P}^2$ denote the branch locus of π_X, and let $\Delta_X \subset \mathbb{P}^2$ be the image of exceptional divisor of $\widetilde{X} \to X$ by π_X.



Theorem 3.3. *Let P be a point of $\mathbb{P}^3$. Let $X \subset \mathbb{P}^3$ be a normal quartic surface with a node P not containing any lines through P. Then the curve Δ_X is an even contact conic of Γ_X. Moreover, the following hold:*

(i) *The following map is surjective:*

$$\begin{Bmatrix} \text{normal quartic surfaces in } \mathbb{P}^3 \text{ with a} \\ \text{node } P \text{ which contain no lines through } P \end{Bmatrix} \to \begin{Bmatrix} \text{pairs of sextic curves and} \\ \text{their even contact conics} \end{Bmatrix}$$
$$X \mapsto (\Gamma_X, \Delta_X)$$

(ii) *Let $(x : y : z : w)$ be a system of homogeneous coordinates of $\mathbb{P}^3$ such that $P = (0 : 0 : 0 : 1)$. Assume that the defining equation of X is given by $g_2\, w^2 + 2\, g_3\, w + g_4 = 0$. Then the defining equations of Γ_X and Δ_X are*

$$\Gamma_X : g_3^2 - g_2\, g_4 = 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \Delta_X : g_2 = 0,$$

where $g_i \in \mathbb{C}[x, y, z]$ is a homogeneous polynomial of degree i for $i = 2, 3, 4$.

(iii) *If we further assume that Δ_X is a simple contact conic of Γ_X, there exist natural surjective maps*

$$\alpha_1 : \begin{Bmatrix} \text{hyperplanes in } \mathbb{P}^3 \\ \text{not containing } P \end{Bmatrix} \to \begin{Bmatrix} \text{cubic curves on } \mathbb{P}^2 \text{ passing through} \\ \text{all tangent points of } \Delta_X \text{ and } \Gamma_X, \\ \text{not containing } \Delta_X \end{Bmatrix}$$

$$\alpha_2 : \begin{Bmatrix} \text{quadric surfaces in } \mathbb{P}^3 \\ \text{smooth at } P. \end{Bmatrix} \to \begin{Bmatrix} \text{quartic curves on } \mathbb{P}^2 \text{ passing through} \\ \text{all tangent points of } \Delta_X \text{ and } \Gamma_X, \\ \text{not containing } \Delta_X \end{Bmatrix}$$

satisfying the following conditions for each singular point $Q \in X \setminus \{P\}$;

(I) *for a hyperplane* $H_1 \subset \mathbb{P}^3$ *with* $P \notin H_1$, $Q \in H_1$ *if and only if* $\pi_X(Q) \in \alpha_1(H_1)$*; and*
(II) *for a quadric surface* $H_2 \subset \mathbb{P}^3$ *smooth at* $P \in H_2$, $Q \in H_2$ *if and only if* $\pi_X(Q) \in \alpha_2(H_2)$

Proof. (i) Let $X \subset \mathbb{P}^3$ be a normal quartic surface with a node P not containing any lines through P. Let $\phi : \widetilde{\mathbb{P}}^3 \to \mathbb{P}^3$ be the blowing-up at P, and let $\widetilde{X}$ be the strict transform of X under ϕ. Note that there is an isomorphism $\widetilde{\mathbb{P}}^3 \cong \mathcal{P}_1$ such that the morphism $\widetilde{\mathbb{P}}^3 \to \mathbb{P}^2$ induced by the projection from P coincides with $\varphi_1 : \widetilde{\mathbb{P}}^3 \cong \mathcal{P}_1 \to \mathbb{P}^2$, and the exceptional divisor of ϕ coincides with the section $S_{1,0} \subset \mathcal{P}_1$. Since P is a node of X, $C_2 := \widetilde{X} \cap S_{1,0}$ is a smooth conic on $S_{1,0}$, and so is $\Delta_X \subset \mathbb{P}^2$. Since X contains no lines through P, by the blowing-up along C_2 and Proposition 3.2, we have the birational map $\theta_{1,2} : \mathcal{P}_1 \dashrightarrow \mathcal{P}_3$, and $\theta_{1,2}$ induces an embedding $\iota : \widetilde{X} \to \mathcal{P}_3 \setminus S_{3,0}$ satisfying the following commutative diagram:



This implies that Γ_X is a sextic curve, and Γ_X is smooth at $\Gamma_X \cap \Delta_X$ since $\widetilde{X}$ is smooth over Δ_X. Moreover, since $\pi_X^*\Delta_X$ is reducible, Δ_X must be an even contact conic of Γ_X.

Conversely, let $\Gamma \subset \mathbb{P}^2$ be a sextic curve with an even contact conic Δ. Let $\pi_\Gamma : \widetilde{X} \to \mathbb{P}^2$ be the double cover branched along Γ. There is an embedding $\iota : \widetilde{X} \to \mathbb{P}_3 \setminus S_{3,0}$ satisfying $\varphi_3 \circ \iota = \pi_\Gamma$. Since Δ is rational, $\pi_\Gamma^*\Delta$ splits into two rational curves Δ_1 and Δ_2. By blowing-up $\mathcal{P}_3$ along Δ_1 and by Proposition 3.2, we obtain an embedding $\iota' : \widetilde{X} \to \mathcal{P}_1$ such that $\iota'(\widetilde{X}) \cap S_{1,0} = \varphi_1^{-1}(\Delta) \cap S_{1,0}$. Since $\widetilde{X}$ is smooth over Δ, $X := \phi \circ \iota'(\widetilde{X}) \subset \mathbb{P}^3$ is a normal quartic surface with a node P, which contains no lines through P, such that $(\Gamma_X, \Delta_X) = (\Gamma, \Delta)$.

Assertion (ii) is clear. Hence we next prove assertion (iii). We may assume that $P = (0:0:0:1)$ and X is defined by $g_2\, w^2 + 2\, g_3 + g_4 = 0$ as in the assumption of (ii). By the argument of the proof of (i), we have the birational map $\tilde{\theta} = \theta_{1,2} \circ \phi^{-1} : \mathbb{P}^3 \dashrightarrow \mathcal{P}_3$ over $\mathbb{P}^2$, which is locally given on $\{(x:y:z:w) \in \mathbb{P}^3 \mid z = 1\}$ by

$$(x\,, y,\, w) \mapsto (x,\, y,\, t) = (x,\, y,\, w\, g_2(x, y, 1))\,,$$

where we regard $(x : y : z)$ as a system of homogeneous coordinates of $\mathbb{P}^2$, and t is a local coordinate of a fiber of $\mathcal{P}_3$ such that $t = g_2 = 0$ gives the center of the blowing-up $\sigma'_{3,2} : V_{3,2} \to \mathcal{P}_3$ in the diagram (2). Then $\tilde{\theta}$ gives a birational map from $X \subset \mathbb{P}^3$ to the subvariety $\widetilde{X} \subset \mathcal{P}_3$ locally given by

$$(t + g_3)^2 - g_3^2 + g_2\, g_4 = 0,$$

which is naturally the double cover of $\mathbb{P}^2$ branched along Γ_X. Note that $t + g_3 = 0$ gives a section $\widetilde{S}$ of $\mathcal{P}_3$ which contains all singularities of $\widetilde{X}$.

Next we construct the map α_1. For a hyperplane $H \subset \mathbb{P}^3$ given by $w + \ell = 0$ for some $\ell \in \mathbb{C}[x, y, z]$, $\tilde{\theta}$ gives a birational map from H to a section $\widetilde{L}$ of $\mathcal{P}_3$ locally

given by

$$t + g_2\,\ell = 0.$$

We define the map α_1 by $\alpha_1(H) = \varphi_3(\widetilde{S} \cap \widetilde{L})$. Since $\alpha_1(H)$ is given by $g_2\,\ell - g_3 = 0$, $\alpha_1(H)$ passes through all tangent points of Δ_X and Γ_X, and $\alpha_1(H)$ does not contain Δ_X. Since $\widetilde{S}$ contains all singularities of $\widetilde{X}$, H contain a singularity $Q \in X \setminus \{P\}$ if and only if $p(Q) \in \alpha_1(H)$.

To construct the map α_2, let H be a quadratic surface of $\mathbb{P}^3$ given by

$$a_1\,w + a_2 = 0,$$

where $a_i \in \mathbb{C}[x, y, z]$ is a homogeneous polynomial of degree i for each $i = 1, 2$ with $a_1 \neq 0$. The birational map $\tilde{\theta}$ gives a birational map from H to a closed subset $\widetilde{H}$ of $\mathcal{P}_3$ locally given by

$$a_1\,t + a_2\,g_2 = 0.$$

We put $\alpha_2(H)$ as $\varphi_3(\widetilde{S} \cap \widetilde{H})$. Since $\alpha_2(H)$ is defined by $a_1\,g_3 - a_2\,g_2 = 0$, $\alpha_2(H)$ passes through all tangent points of Δ_X and Γ_X, and $\alpha_2(H)$ does not contain Δ_X. Moreover, H contains a singular point $Q \in X \setminus \{P\}$ if and only if $p(Q) \in \alpha_2(H)$.

We finally prove that α_1 and α_2 are surjective. Let C_3 and C_4 be curves on $\mathbb{P}^2$ of degree 3 and 4, respectively, through all tangent points of Δ_X and Γ_X, which do not contain Δ_X. From the exact sequence

$$0 \to H^0(\mathbb{P}^2, \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^2}(i-2)) \overset{\times g_2}{\to} H^0(\mathbb{P}^2, \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^2}(i)) \to H^0(\Delta_X, \mathcal{O}_{\Delta_X}(i)) \to 0$$

for $i = 3, 4$, we may assume that C_3 and C_4 are defined by

$$\ell_0\,g_3 - \ell_1\,g_2 = 0 \ \text{ and } \ a_1\,g_3 - a_2\,g_2 = 0,$$

respectively, where $\ell_0 \in \mathbb{C}$, $\ell_1, a_1 \in H^0(\mathbb{P}^2, \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^2}(1))$ and $a_2 \in H^0(\mathbb{P}^2, \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^2}(2))$. Since C_3 and C_4 do not contain Δ_X, $\ell_0 \neq 0$ and $a_1 \neq 0$. Hence $C_3 = \alpha(H_1)$ and $C_4 = \beta(H_2)$, where H_1 and H_2 are given by $\ell_0\,w + \ell_1 = 0$ and $a_1\,w + a_2 = 0$, respectively. □

4. Nodal quartic surfaces in $\mathbb{P}^3$

In this section, we recall a geometric difference of syzygetic and asyzygetic quartic surfaces in detail. In order to do this, we investigate the dimension of the linear systems on $\mathbb{P}^3$ consisting of quadric surfaces through given points.

4.1. Linear systems on $\mathbb{P}^1 \times \mathbb{P}^1$ and $\mathbb{P}^3$.

In this subsection, we give a bound on the dimension of linear systems on $\mathbb{P}^3$ with 8 assigned base points in "general" position. We first consider linear systems on $\mathbb{P}^1 \times \mathbb{P}^1$. Let p_1 and p_2 denote the two projections from $\mathbb{P}^1 \times \mathbb{P}^1$ to $\mathbb{P}^1$.

Lemma 4.1. *Let $P_1, \ldots, P_r$ be r distinct points of $\mathbb{P}^1 \times \mathbb{P}^1$, and let C be a $(1,1)$-curve on $\mathbb{P}^1 \times \mathbb{P}^1$. Put $\mathfrak{d} := |C - P_1 - \cdots - P_r|$.*

(i) *In the case where $r = 2$, $\mathfrak{d}$ has no unassigned base points if $p_j(P_1) \neq p_j(P_2)$ for $j = 1, 2$.*
(ii) *In the case where $r = 3$, $\dim \mathfrak{d} = 0$ if $\sharp(p_j^{-1}(Q) \cap \{P_1, P_2, P_3\}) \leq 2$ for any $Q \in \mathbb{P}^1$ and $j = 1, 2$.*

Proof. (i) The divisors $p_1^*(p_1(P_1)) + p_2^*(p_2(P_2))$ and $p_1^*(p_1(P_2)) + p_2^*(p_2(P_1))$ are elements of $\mathfrak{d}$, and they meet transversally at P_1 and P_2. This implies that $\mathfrak{d}$ has no unassigned base points.

(ii) By the assumption, we may assume that $p_j(P_1) \neq p_j(P_2)$ for any $j = 1, 2$. Since $\dim |C| = 3$, (i) implies that $\dim \mathfrak{d} = 0$. □

Proposition 4.2. *Let $P_1, \ldots, P_r$ be r points of $\mathbb{P}^1 \times \mathbb{P}^1$, and let D be a $(2,2)$-curve. Assume that*

(a) *for any $Q \in \mathbb{P}^1$ and any $j = 1, 2$, $\sharp(p_j^{-1}(Q) \cap \{P_1, \ldots, P_r\}) \leq 2$, and*
(b) *no $(1,1)$-curves contain five points of $P_1, \ldots, P_r$.*

Then, if $r = 7$, $\dim |D - P_1 - \cdots - P_7| = 1$. In particular, if $r = 8$, then $0 \leq \dim |D - P_1 - \cdots - P_8| \leq 1$.

Proof. We put $\mathfrak{d} := |D - P_1 - \cdots - P_6|$. Since $\dim |D| = 8$, it is sufficient to prove that P_7 is not an unassigned base point of $\mathfrak{d}$. We put $F_{j,i} := p_j^*(p_j(P_i))$ for $i = 1, \ldots, 7$ and $j = 1, 2$.

Case 1. Suppose that there exists a $(1,1)$-curve C passing through four points of $P_1, \ldots, P_6$. We may assume that $C_{1234} := C$ passes through $P_1, \ldots, P_4$. By the assumption (b), $P_7 \notin C_{1234}$. If $F_{j,5} \neq F_{j,6}$ for any $j = 1, 2$, then there exists a $(1,1)$-curve C_{56} passing through P_5 and P_6 but not P_7 by Lemma 4.1. Hence $C_{1234} + C_{56}$ is a $(2,2)$-curve not passing through P_7, but $P_1, \ldots, P_6$. If $F_{j,5} = F_{j,6}$ for some $j = 1, 2$, say $j = 1$, then $P_7 \notin F_{1,5}$ by the assumption (a). By choosing $Q \in \mathbb{P}^1$ such that $p_2(P_7) \neq Q$, $C_{1234} + F_{1,5} + p_2^*(Q)$ is a $(2,2)$-curve not passing through P_7, but $P_1, \ldots, P_6$.

Case 2. Suppose that no $(1,1)$-curves pass through four points of $P_1, \ldots, P_6$. Let C_{ijk} be the $(1,1)$-curve passing through distinct three points P_i, P_j, P_k of $P_1, \ldots, P_6$. Note that C_{ijk} is determined uniquely by Lemma 4.1 (ii), and $C_{ijk} \neq C_{i'j'k'}$ if $\{i, j, k\} \neq \{i', j', k'\}$. If $P_7 \notin C_{123}$ and $P_7 \notin C_{456}$, we have nothing to prove.

Suppose $P_7 \in C_{123}$, and C_{123} is reducible. By assumption (a), we may assume that $C_{123} = F_{1,1} + F_{2,3}$, $F_{1,1} = F_{1,2}$ and $F_{2,3} = F_{2,7}$. Also by assumption (a), $F_{1,1}$ and $F_{2,3}$ are not irreducible components of C_{13i} for any $i = 4, 5, 6$. Since the intersection number $C_{123}.C_{13i} = 2$, C_{13i} does not pass through P_7 for $i = 4, 5, 6$. If $P_7 \in C_{2ij}$ for any $i, j = 4, 5, 6$ with $i \neq j$, then it follows from $C_{245}.C_{246} = 2$ and assumption (a) that C_{245} and C_{246} are reducible and have one common component; in this case, the common component must contain three points P_2, P_4, P_7, which is a contradiction to (a). Thus $P_7 \notin C_{2ij}$ for some $i, j = 4, 5, 6$, say $i = 4, j = 5$, and $C_{136} + C_{245}$ is a $(2,2)$-curve not passing through P_7, but $P_1, \ldots, P_6$.

Suppose $P_7 \in C_{123}$, and C_{123} is irreducible. Then $P_7 \notin C_{12i}$ for $i = 4, 5, 6$. Suppose $P_7 \in C_{3ij}$ for some $i, j = 4, 5, 6$, say $i = 4, j = 5$, then we may assume by the above argument that C_{345} is irreducible. In this case, we have $P_7 \notin C_{346}$. Thus $C_{125} + C_{346}$ is a $(2,2)$-curve not passing through P_7, but $P_1, \ldots, P_6$. Therefore we have proved the assertion. □

Definition 4.3. For r points $P_1, \ldots, P_r \in \mathbb{P}^1 \times \mathbb{P}^1$ with $r \leq 8$, we say that $P_1, \ldots, P_r$ are *in general position* if $P_1, \ldots, P_r$ satisfy the assumption (a) and (b) in Proposition 4.2.

We will use the following lemma later.

Lemma 4.4. *Let $P_1, \ldots, P_5 \in \mathbb{P}^1 \times \mathbb{P}^1$ be five points in general position, and let D be a $(1,2)$-curve on $\mathbb{P}^1 \times \mathbb{P}^1$. Then* $\dim |D - P_1 - \cdots - P_5| = 0$.

Proof. We have $\dim |D - P_1 - \cdots - P_5| \geq 0$ since $\dim |D| = 5$. It is sufficient to prove that P_5 is not an unassigned base point of $\mathfrak{d} := |D - P_1 - \cdots - P_4|$. From the condition (a) in Proposition 4.2, there are $i_1, i_2 \in \{1, \ldots, 4\}$ such that $p_2(P_{i_1}) \neq p_2(P_5)$ and $p_2(P_{i_2}) \neq p_2(P_5)$, say $i_1 = 1$ and $i_2 = 2$. Let C_{ijk} be the $(1,1)$-curve as in the proof of Proposition 4.2. If $P_5 \in C_{i34}$ for $i = 1, 2$, then C_{134} and C_{234} have a common component F which contains P_5. This implies that P_5 is contained in a ruling of $\mathbb{P}^1 \times \mathbb{P}^1$ passing through two points of $P_1, \ldots, P_4$, which is a contradiction. Hence $P_5 \notin C_{i34}$ for some $i = 1, 2$, say $i = 2$. Then $D_{234} + p_2^*(p_2(P_1))$ is an element of $\mathfrak{d}$ no passing through P_5. □

Next we consider linear systems on $\mathbb{P}^3$. We say that r points $P_1, \ldots, P_r \in \mathbb{P}^3$ with $r \leq 8$ are *in general position* if

(A) no three points of $P_1, \ldots, P_r$ are collinear, and
(B) no hyperplanes in $\mathbb{P}^3$ contain five points of $P_1, \ldots, P_r$.

Proposition 4.5. *Let $P_1, \ldots, P_8 \in \mathbb{P}^3$ be eight points in general position, and let D be a quadratic surface in $\mathbb{P}^3$, i.e., $\deg D = 2$. Then $1 \leq \dim |D - P_1 - \cdots - P_8| \leq 2$.*

Proof. We put $\mathfrak{d} := |D - P_1 - \cdots - P_8|$. Since $\dim |D| = 9$, we have $\dim \mathfrak{d} \geq 1$. The condition (A) and (B) implies that the number of reducible members in $\mathfrak{d}$ is finite. Hence there exist irreducible members in $\mathfrak{d}$.

First we consider the case where there is a smooth quadratic surface D_0 in $\mathfrak{d}$. The conditions (A) and (B) imply that $P_1, \ldots, P_8$ are in general position as points on $D_0 \cong \mathbb{P}^1 \times \mathbb{P}^1$. Hence $0 \leq \dim \mathfrak{d}|_{D_0} \leq 1$ from Proposition 4.2, and we have $1 \leq \dim \mathfrak{d} \leq 2$.

If all members of $\mathfrak{d}$ are singular, then there exists a point $P' \in \mathbb{P}^3$ such that P' is a singular point of all members of $\mathfrak{d}$. Let $\pi_{P'} : \mathbb{P}^3 \setminus \{P'\} \to \mathbb{P}^2$ be the projection from P'. In this case, for each member $D' \in \mathfrak{d}$, there exists a conic $C' \subset \mathbb{P}^2$ with $\pi_{P'}(P_i) \in C'$ $(i = 1, \ldots, 8)$ such that D' is the closure of $\pi_{P'}^{-1}(C')$ in $\mathbb{P}^3$. From the conditions (A), (B) and $\dim \mathfrak{d} \geq 1$, the image of $\{P_1, \ldots, P_8\}$ under $\pi_{P'}$ is a set of 4 points such that no three points of them are collinear. This implies that $\dim \mathfrak{d} = 1$. □

Proposition 4.6. *Let $P_1, \ldots, P_8 \in \mathbb{P}^3$ be eight points in general position, and D a quadratic surface in $\mathbb{P}^3$. Put $\mathfrak{d} := |D - P_1 - \cdots - P_8|$. If $\dim \mathfrak{d} = 2$, then $\mathfrak{d}$ has no unassigned base points.*

Proof. From the proof of Proposition 4.5, there is a smooth member D_0 of $\mathfrak{d}$. Since $\dim \mathfrak{d}|_{D_0} = 1$, Lemma 4.1 and 4.4 imply that $\mathfrak{d}|_{D_0}$ has no fixed components. Thus the set of base points of $\mathfrak{d}|_{D_0}$ is $\{P_1, \ldots, P_8\}$ as points of $D_0 \cong \mathbb{P}^1 \times \mathbb{P}^1$. Hence the set of base points of $\mathfrak{d}$ is $\{P_1, \ldots, P_8\}$. Moreover, the intersection number $(D_0, D_1, D_2) = 8$ for $D_i \in \mathfrak{d}$ $(i = 0, 1, 2)$ which span $\mathfrak{d}$. This implies that D_0, D_1 and D_2 meet at $P_1, \ldots, P_8$ transversally. Thus $\mathfrak{d}$ has no unassigned base points. □

Remark 4.7. Let D be a quadratic surface in $\mathbb{P}^3$, and let $P_1, \ldots, P_8$ be eight points in $\mathbb{P}^3$. Put $\mathfrak{d} := |D - P_1 - \cdots - P_8|$. If $\mathfrak{d}$ has no unassigned base points, then $P_1, \ldots, P_8$ are in general position.

Proof. Suppose that there exists a line $L \subset \mathbb{P}^3$ with $P_1, P_2, P_3 \in L$. Let D_0 be a member of $\mathfrak{d}$, and let H be a hyperplane with $L \subset H$ and $H \not\subset D_0$. Then $D_0|_H$ is a conic on $H \cong \mathbb{P}^2$ passing through P_1, P_2, P_3. Thus $L \subset D_0$, which is a contradiction.

Suppose there exists a hyperplane $H \subset \mathbb{P}^3$ with $P_1, \ldots, P_5 \in H$. By the above argument, we may assume that no three points of $P_1, \ldots, P_5$ are collinear. If $D_0 \in \mathfrak{d}$, then $D_0|_H$ is the unique conic on H passing through $P_1, \ldots, P_5$, which is a contradiction □

We prove the following lemma about a linear system on the Hirzebruch surface $p : \Sigma_2 \to \mathbb{P}^1$ of degree two. Let S_0 be the section of p with $S_0^2 = -2$. Note that there is a morphism $\sigma : \Sigma_2 \to \mathbb{P}^3$ whose image is a cone of degree two in $\mathbb{P}^3$ and which is the contraction of S_0.

Lemma 4.8. *Let $p : \Sigma_2 \to \mathbb{P}^1$ be the Hirzebruch surface of degree two, and $\sigma : \Sigma_2 \to \mathbb{P}^3$ as above. Let S_0 and F denote the section with $S_0^2 = -2$ and a fiber of p, respectively. If an effective divisor D on Σ_2 is linearly equivalent to $S_0 + 2F$, then there is a hyperplane H of $\mathbb{P}^3$ satisfying $\sigma^* H = D$.*

Proof. We have a morphism $\sigma^* : |H| \to |S_0 + 2F|$. It is clear that σ^* is injective. Since $\dim |H| = \dim |S_0 + 2F| = 3$, σ^* is bijection. □

4.2. **Syzygetic quartic surfaces.** In this subsection we recall the geometry of nodes on a quartic surface.

Definition 4.9. Let $X \subset \mathbb{P}^3$ be a hypersurface.

(i) We call X a *nodal surface* if all singularities of X are nodes, i.e. A_1-singularities. Moreover, for a positive integer r, we call a nodal surface X a *r-nodal surface* if the number of nodes of X is equal to r.

(ii) We call a nodal quartic surface X a *syzygetic quartic surface* if there are three quadratic forms $f_1, f_2, f_3 \in H^0(\mathbb{P}^3, \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^3}(2))$ such that X is defined by $f_1^2 + f_2^2 + f_3^2 = 0$, otherwise, we call X an *asyzygetic quartic surface*.

(iii) Let X be a syzygetic quartic surface defined by $f_1^2 + f_2^2 + f_3^2 = 0$. We call a node $P \in X$ an *assigned node* with respect to f_1, f_2, f_3 if $f_1 = f_2 = f_3 = 0$ at P, otherwise, we call P an *unassigned node*.

Remark 4.10. By uniqueness of canonical forms of quadratic forms, assigned nodes of a syzygetic quartic surface do not depend on the choice of quadratic forms $f_1, f_2, f_3 \in H^0(\mathbb{P}^3, \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^3}(2))$. Hence we simply call an assigned nodes with respect to f_1, f_2, f_3 an assigned nodes.

Proposition 4.11. *Let $X \subset \mathbb{P}^3$ be a nodal quartic surface. Then X is syzygetic if and only if there are eight nodes $P_1, \ldots, P_8 \in X$ in general position with $\dim \mathfrak{d} = 2$, where $\mathfrak{d} := |D - P_1 - \cdots - P_8|$ for a quadratic surface $D \subset \mathbb{P}^3$. In this case, the eight points $P_1, \ldots, P_8$ are the assigned nodes of X.*

Proof. Suppose that X is defined by $f_1^2 + f_2^2 + f_3^2 = 0$ for some quadratic forms f_1, f_2, f_3. Let C_i be the quadratic surface given by $f_i = 0$ for $i = 1, 2, 3$. Then X has singularities at $C_1 \cap C_2 \cap C_3$. Hence the set $C_1 \cap C_2 \cap C_3$ is contained in the singular locus of X. This implies that f_1, f_2 and f_3 are linearly independent over $\mathbb{C}$ since the singular locus of X consists of finite points. Moreover, since the intersection number $(C_1, C_2, C_3) = 8$, if $\sharp(C_1 \cap C_2 \cap C_3) < 8$, then X has a singularity which is not a node; this is a contradiction. Hence $C_1 \cap C_2 \cap C_3$ consists of eight points $P_1, \ldots, P_8$, and $C_1, C_2, C_3 \in \mathfrak{d} := |D - P_1 - \cdots - P_8|$, and $\dim \mathfrak{d} \geq 2$. If there exists a line $L \subset \mathbb{P}^3$ through three points of $P_1, \ldots, P_8$, then $L \subset C_i$ $(i = 1, 2, 3)$ since the intersection number $(L, C_i) = 2$; hence X is singular along L, which is a contradiction. Thus no three of the eight nodes of X

are collinear. If there exists a hyperplane $H \subset \mathbb{P}^3$ through five points of $P_1, \dots, P_8$, then either $H \subset C_i$ or $C_i|_H$ is the unique conic on H through the five nodes of X; hence $\dim(C_1 \cap C_2 \cap C_3) \geq 1$, which is a contradiction. Therefore $P_1, \dots, P_8$ are in general position. From Proposition 4.5, we have $\dim \mathfrak{d} = 2$.

Suppose that there exist eight nodes $P_1, \dots, P_8 \in X$ in general position and $\dim \mathfrak{d} = 2$. Let $\Phi_{\mathfrak{d}} : \mathbb{P}^3 \dashrightarrow \mathbb{P}^2$ be the rational map defined by $\mathfrak{d}$, and let $\sigma : \widetilde{\mathbb{P}}^3 \to \mathbb{P}^3$ be the blowing-up of $\mathbb{P}^3$ at the eight points $P_1, \dots, P_8$. By Proposition 4.6, we have the morphism $\widetilde{\Phi}_{\mathfrak{d}} : \widetilde{\mathbb{P}}^3 \to \mathbb{P}^2$ such that $\widetilde{\Phi}_{\mathfrak{d}} = \Phi_{\mathfrak{d}} \circ \sigma$. Moreover, the proper transformation $\widetilde{X}$ of X under σ gives the minimal resolution of singularities $P_1, \dots, P_8$ of X since $P_1, \dots, P_8$ are A_1-singularities of X. We denote the inclusion from $\widetilde{X}$ to $\widetilde{\mathbb{P}}^3$ by $\iota : \widetilde{X} \hookrightarrow \widetilde{\mathbb{P}}^3$, and put $\pi := \widetilde{\Phi}_{\mathfrak{d}} \circ \iota : \widetilde{X} \to \mathbb{P}^2$.



Let $E_1, \dots, E_8$ be the exceptional divisors of σ. Since $\widetilde{\Phi}_{\mathfrak{d}}^* \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^2}(1) = \mathcal{O}_{\widetilde{\mathbb{P}}^3}(\sigma^* D - E_1 - \cdots - E_8)$, for $i = 1, \dots, 8$, we have

$$\widetilde{\Phi}_{\mathfrak{d}}^* \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^2}(1) \otimes \mathcal{O}_{E_i} \cong \mathcal{O}_{\widetilde{\mathbb{P}}^3}(-E_i) \otimes \mathcal{O}_{E_i} \cong \mathcal{O}_{E_i}(1).$$

Hence the restriction of $\widetilde{\Phi}_{\mathfrak{d}}$ to E_i is an isomorphism $\widetilde{\Phi}_{\mathfrak{d}}|_{E_i} : E_i \xrightarrow{\sim} \mathbb{P}^2$. Since P_i, $i = 1, \dots, 8$, are double points, $\Gamma_i := \widetilde{\Phi}_{\mathfrak{d}}(E_i \cap \widetilde{X})$ are irreducible conics in $\mathbb{P}^2$. For a line L on $\mathbb{P}^2$, since $\pi^* L \sim \iota^*(\sigma^* D - E_1 - \cdots - E_8)$, the self-intersection number $(\pi^* L)^2 = 0$. This implies $\dim \pi(\widetilde{X}) \leq 1$. Since $\Gamma_i \subset \pi(\widetilde{X})$, $\Gamma := \pi(\widetilde{X})$ is an irreducible conic in $\mathbb{P}^2$. We may assume that Γ is given by $u_1^2 + u_2^2 + u_3^2 = 0$, where u_1, u_2, u_3 are homogeneous coordinates of $\mathbb{P}^2$. Let X' be the quartic surface given by $f_1^2 + f_2^2 + f_3^2 = 0$, where $f_i = \Phi_{\mathfrak{d}}^* u_i$. Note that X' is the closure of $\Phi^{-1}(\Gamma)$ in $\mathbb{P}^3$. Hence $X \subset X'$, and since both surfaces X and X' are quartic surfaces, we have $X = X'$. Therefore X is syzygetic. Moreover, it is clear that $P_1, \dots, P_8$ are the assigned nodes of X. □

5. Improvement of criterion for nodal splitting curves of type $(2, 4)$

In this section, we show a correspondence of syzygetic quartic surfaces and nodal splitting curves of type $(2, 4)$. Let $X \subset \mathbb{P}^3$ be a nodal quartic surface with a node at $\overline{P}_0$ not containing any lines through $\overline{P}_0$. Let $p : X \setminus \{\overline{P}_0\} \to \mathbb{P}^2$ be the projection from $\overline{P}_0$, $\Gamma_X \subset \mathbb{P}^2$ the branch locus of the double cover over induced by p, and Δ_X the image of exceptional divisor of the blowing-up of X at $\overline{P}_0$ (see Section 5 for detail). Note that, for a sextic curve Γ with an even contact conic Δ, there exists a quartic surface $X \subset \mathbb{P}^3$ such that $\Gamma_X = \Gamma$ and $\Delta_X = \Delta$ by Theorem 3.3. Throughout this following, we assume that $X \subset \mathbb{P}^3$ satisfies the above conditions and furthermore assume that Δ_X is a simple contact conic of Γ_X. Let $T_1, \dots, T_6$ denote the distinct tangent points of Γ_X and Δ_X.

Proposition 5.1. *Let $X \subset \mathbb{P}^3$, $\overline{P}_0$ and $p : X \setminus \{\overline{P}_0\} \to \mathbb{P}^2$ be as above. If there exist six nodes $\overline{P}_1, \dots, \overline{P}_6 \in X$ on a conic $\overline{C}_0$ in a hyperplane $\overline{H} \subset \mathbb{P}^3$, and no four points of $\overline{P}_1, \dots, \overline{P}_6$ are collinear, then Γ_X is a splitting curve of type $(3, 3)$ with*

respect to Δ_X. *Moreover, there is a* $(3,3)$*-curve* $D^+ \subset \mathbb{P}^1 \times \mathbb{P}^1$ *such that*

$$\pi_{\Delta_X}^* \Gamma_X = D^+ + D^- \text{ and } \pi_{\Delta_X}(D^+ \cap D^-) = \{P_1, \dots, P_6, T_1, \dots, T_6\},$$

where $D^- = \iota_{\Delta_X}^* D^+$ *and* $P_i = p(\overline{P}_i)$ *for* $i = 1, \dots, 6$.

Proof. Without loss of generality, we may assume that

$$(\star) \begin{cases} \overline{P}_0 = [0:0:0:1], \\ X \text{ is defined by } g_2 w^2 + 2 g_3 w + g_4 = 0, \end{cases}$$

where $g_i \in \mathbb{C}[x,y,z]$ $(i = 2,3,4)$ are homogeneous polynomials of degree i. We may also assume that the hyperplane $\overline{H}$ is defined by $w = 0$. Note that $X \cap \overline{H}$ is a quartic divisor on $\overline{H}$ which is singular at the six points $\overline{P}_1, \dots, \overline{P}_6$. Since no four points of $\overline{P}_1, \dots, \overline{P}_6$ are collinear, $\overline{C}_0$ is the unique conic on $\overline{H}$ through $\overline{P}_1, \dots, \overline{P}_6$. Hence $w = g_4 = 0$ defines the divisor $2\overline{C}_0$ on $\overline{H}$. Thus there is a homogeneous polynomial $f_2 \in \mathbb{C}[x,y,z]$ of degree 2 such that $g_4 = f_2^2$, and $\{\overline{P}_1, \dots, \overline{P}_6\}$ is defined by $w = g_3 = f_2 = 0$. Hence $g_3 = 0$ defines a cubic curve on $\mathbb{P}^2$ through $P_1, \dots, P_6, T_1, \dots, T_6$. By Theorem 2.4, Γ_X is a splitting curve of type $(3,3)$ with respect to Δ_X. The second assertion follows from the proof of Theorem 2.4. □

Lemma 5.2. *Let* $\Gamma \subset \mathbb{P}^2$ *be a nodal sextic curve with a simple contact conic* Δ. *Assume that* $\pi_\Delta^* \Gamma = D^+ + D^-$ *for a* $(2,4)$*-curve* D^+ *and* $D^- = \iota_\Delta^* D^+$. *Let* $P_1, \dots, P_7$ *be the seven nodes of* Γ *such that* $\pi_\Delta(D^+ \cap D^-) = \{P_1, \dots, P_7, T_1, \dots, T_6\}$. *Then the following conditions hold;*

(i) *no four points of* $P_1, \dots, P_7$ *are collinear;*
(ii) *if* $\pi_\Delta^* \Gamma = E^+ + E^-$ *for a* $(3,3)$*-curve* $E^+ \subset \mathbb{P}^1 \times \mathbb{P}^1$ *and* $E^- = \iota_\Delta^* E^+$, *then*

$$\pi_\Delta(E^+ \cap E^-) \not\subset \pi_\Delta(D^+ \cap D^-) = \{P_1, \dots, P_7, T_1, \dots, T_6\}.$$

Proof. We first prove the condition (i). Suppose that four nodes $P_1, \dots, P_4 \in \Gamma$ are on a line $L_0 \subset \mathbb{P}^2$. Since $L_0.\Gamma_X = 6$, L_0 is a component of Γ_X, say $\Gamma_X = L_0 + \Gamma'_X$. Hence $D^+ = L_0^+ + D_0^+$ and $D^- = L_0^- + D_0^-$, where $\pi_{\Delta_X}^* L_0 = L_0^+ + L_0^-$ and $\pi_{\Delta_X}^* \Gamma'_X = D_0^+ + D_0^-$. Note that D_0^- and L_0^+ are either $(3,2)$- and $(0,1)$-curves or $(4,1)$- and $(1,0)$-curves respectively. In this case, the set $\{P_1, \dots, P_4\}$ is the image of $L_0^+ \cap D_0^-$ under π_Δ, which is contradiction to $L_0^+.D_0^- \leq 3$. Therefore no four nodes of $P_1, \dots, P_7$ are collinear.

Suppose that $\pi_\Delta^* \Gamma = E^+ + E^-$ for a $(3,3)$-curve $E^+ \subset \mathbb{P}^1 \times \mathbb{P}^1$ and $E^- = \iota_\Delta^* E^+$. Let C^+ be the common component of D^+ and E^+, and put $D^+ = D_0^+ + C^+$, $E^+ = E_0^+ + C^+$, $D^- = D_0^- + C^-$ and $E^- = E_0^- + C^-$, where $C^- = \iota_\Delta^* C^+$. Then we have $E_0^+ = D_0^-$ and $E_0^- = D_0^+$. Since $E_0^+ \cap C^- \subset E^+ \cap E^-$ and $E_0^+ \cap C^- = D_0^- \cap C^- \not\subset D^+ \cap D^-$, we obtain $E^+ \cap E^- \not\subset D^+ \cap D^-$. Thus the condition (ii) holds. □

Theorem 5.3. *Let* $X \subset \mathbb{P}^3$, $\overline{P}_0$ *and* $p : X \setminus \{\overline{P}_0\} \to \mathbb{P}^2$ *be as in Proposition 5.1. Then the followings are equivalent:*

(i) X *is syzygetic such that* $\overline{P}_0$ *is an assigned node of* X;
(ii) Γ_X *is a splitting curve of type* $(2,4)$ *with respect to* Δ_X;
(iii) *there exist seven nodes* $\overline{P}_1, \dots, \overline{P}_7$ *of* X *satisfying the following conditions:*
  (iii-a) *there exist no conics on* $\mathbb{P}^2$ *through the seven points* $P_1, \dots, P_7$, *where* $P_i = p(\overline{P}_i)$ *for* $i = 1, \dots, 7$;

(iii-b) $\dim \mathfrak{d} \geq 2$, *where* $\mathfrak{d} := |4\,L - P_1 - \cdots - P_7 - T_1 - \cdots - T_6|$ *for a line* $L \subset \mathbb{P}^2$*;*

(iii-c) *if three points* $P_{i_1}, P_{i_2}, P_{i_3}$ *of* $P_1, \ldots, P_7$ *are collinear, then any cubic curve through the nine points* $P_{i_1}, P_{i_2}, P_{i_3}, T_1, \ldots, T_6$ *contains* Δ_X*;*

(iii-d) *for any five points* $P_{i_1}, \ldots, P_{i_5}$ *of* $P_1, \ldots, P_7$*, there exist no cubic curves through the eleven points* $P_{i_1}, \ldots, P_{i_5}, T_1, \ldots, T_6$*.*

Proof. We first prove that conditions (i) and (iii) are equivalent. Suppose that condition (i) holds. Let $\overline{P}_1, \ldots, \overline{P}_7$ be the other assigned nodes of X. By Proposition 4.11 and Theorem 3.3 (iii), condition (iii-b) holds. Since the eight points $\overline{P}_0, \ldots, \overline{P}_7$ are in general position, we have $\dim \mathfrak{d} = 2$. Let $\bar{\mathfrak{d}}$ be the linear system $|2\overline{H} - \overline{P}_0 - \cdots - \overline{P}_7|$ on $\mathbb{P}^3$, where $\overline{H}$ is a hyperplane. Since the intersection number $(2\overline{H}, 2\overline{H}, 2\overline{H})$ is equal to eight for a hyperplane $\overline{H} \subset \mathbb{P}^3$, there exist no members of $\bar{\mathfrak{d}}$ which are singular at $\overline{P}_0$. Hence the condition (iii-a) holds. If three points P_1, P_2, P_3 are on a line $L \subset \mathbb{P}^2$, and there is a cubic curve $C_3 \subset \mathbb{P}^2$ through the nine points $P_1, P_2, P_3, T_1, \ldots, T_6$ which does not contain Δ_X, then $\overline{P}_1, \overline{P}_2, \overline{P}_3$ are on two hyperplanes $\overline{H}_1, \overline{H}_2$ such that $p(\overline{H}_1 \setminus \{\overline{P}_0\}) = L$ and $\alpha(\overline{H}_2) = C_3$ by Theorem 3.3 (iii), which is a contradiction to the assumption that $\overline{P}_0, \ldots, \overline{P}_7$ are in general position. Hence condition (iii-c) holds. If there exists a cubic curve C_3 through eleven points $P_1, \ldots, P_5, T_1, \ldots, T_6$, then C_3 contains Δ_X by Theorem 3.3 (iii), which is contradiction to condition (iii-a). Hence (iii-d) holds.

Conversely, we suppose that condition (iii) holds. The correspondences α_1 and α_2 in Theorem 3.3 (iii) implies $\dim \bar{\mathfrak{d}} \geq 2$ and that the eight points $\overline{P}_0, \ldots, \overline{P}_7$ are in general position. By Proposition 4.11, condition (i) holds.

We next prove that conditions (i) and (ii) are equivalent. Assume that condition (i) holds. Furthermore we can assume ($\star$) in the proof of Proposition 5.1 and that X is defined by

$$f_3^2 - 4\,f_1\,f_2 = 0,$$

where f_1, f_2, $f_3 \in \mathbb{C}[x, y, z, w]$ are homogeneous polynomials of degree two such that $f_1 = f_2 = f_3 = 0$ at $\overline{P}_0$. Hence f_1, f_2 and f_3 are of the form

$$f_1 = a_1\,w + a_2, \qquad f_2 = b_1\,w + b_2, \qquad f_3 = c_1\,w + c_2,$$

where $a_i, b_i, c_i \in \mathbb{C}[x, y, z]$ are homogeneous polynomials of degree i for $i = 1, 2$. Since X has a node at $\overline{P}_0$, the linear forms a_1, b_1, c_1 are linearly independent over $\mathbb{C}$. Hence we may assume that $a_1 = x$, $b_1 = y$, $c_1 = z$. Then the conic Δ_X is given by $z^2 - 4\,x\,y = 0$ by Theorem 3.3 (ii). In this case, the double cover $\pi_{\Delta_X} : \mathbb{P}^1 \times \mathbb{P}^1 \to \mathbb{P}^2$ is given by $([s_1 : s_2], [t_1 : t_2]) \mapsto [s_1\,t_1 : s_2\,t_2 : s_1\,t_2 + s_2\,t_1]$. By direct computation, we can see that $\pi_{\Delta_X}^* \Gamma_X$ is defined by

$$(s_1^2\,\pi_{\Delta_X}^* b_2 - s_1\,s_2\,\pi_{\Delta_X}^* c_2 + s_2^2\,\pi_{\Delta_X}^* a_2)(t_1^2\,\pi_{\Delta_X}^* b_2 - t_1\,t_2\,\pi_{\Delta_X}^* c_2 + t_2^2\,\pi_{\Delta_X}^* a_1) = 0.$$

Thus Γ_X is a splitting curve of type $(2, 4)$ with respect to Δ_X.

Conversely, we assume that $\pi_{\Delta_X}^* \Gamma_X = D^+ + D^-$, where D^+ is a $(2, 4)$-curve on $\mathbb{P}^1 \times \mathbb{P}^1$, and $D^- = \iota_{\Delta_X}^* D^+$. We put $P_1, \ldots, P_7$ as the nodes of Γ_X such that the image of $D^+ \cap D^-$ under π_{Δ_X} is $\{P_1, \ldots, P_7, T_1, \ldots, T_6\}$, and let $\overline{P}_1, \ldots, \overline{P}_7 \in X$ be nodes of X with $p(\overline{P}_i) = P_i$ for $i = 1, \ldots, 7$. By Proposition 4.11, it is sufficient to prove that $\overline{P}_0, \ldots, \overline{P}_7$ are in general position and $\dim \bar{\mathfrak{d}} \geq 2$. By Corollary 2.6 and Theorem 3.3 (iii), we obtain $\dim \bar{\mathfrak{d}} \geq 2$.

Suppose that five points of $\overline{P}_0, \ldots, \overline{P}_8$ are on a hyperplane $\overline{H}_0 \subset \mathbb{P}^3$. By Lemma 5.2, we may assume $\overline{P}_1, \ldots, \overline{P}_5$ and $\overline{P}_0 \notin \overline{H}_0$. Hence we may assume

that $\overline{H}_0$ is defined by $w = 0$. If $\overline{P}_6 \in \overline{H}_0$, then $\overline{P}_1, \ldots, \overline{P}_6$ are on a conic $\overline{C}$ on $\overline{H}_0$. Indeed, if $\overline{P}_6 \in \overline{H}_0$, then either $\overline{P}_1, \ldots, \overline{P}_6$ are on a conic on $\overline{H}_0$, or $\overline{H}_0$ is a fixed component of $\bar{\mathfrak{d}}$; if $\overline{H}_0$ is a fixed component of $\bar{\mathfrak{d}}$, then $\overline{P}_7 \in \overline{H}_0$ since $\dim \bar{\mathfrak{d}} \geq 2$, hence $X|_{\overline{H}_0} = 2\overline{C}$ for some conic $\overline{C}$ on $\overline{H}_0$ since $X|_{\overline{H}_0}$ is a quartic divisor on $\overline{H}_0$ with seven singular points. Thus if $\overline{P}_6 \in \overline{H}_0$, then, by Proposition 5.1 and Lemma 5.2 (i), Γ_X is a splitting curve of type $(3,3)$, which is contradiction to Lemma 5.2 (ii). Therefore, $\overline{P}_6$ and $\overline{P}_7$ are not on $\overline{H}_0$.

Let $\overline{C} \subset \overline{H}_0$ be the unique conic through the five points $\overline{P}_1, \ldots, \overline{P}_5$. If all members of $\bar{\mathfrak{d}}$ are singular, then $\overline{C}$ is reducible and the singular point $\overline{P}$ of $\overline{C}$ is a singular point of all member of $\bar{\mathfrak{d}}$. In this case, the three points $\overline{P}_0$, $\overline{P}_6$ and $\overline{P}_7$ are collinear since $\dim \bar{\mathfrak{d}} \geq 2$ and no four points of $P_1, \ldots, P_7$ are collinear, which is a contradiction to that X contains no lines through $\overline{P}_0$. Hence there is a smooth member $\overline{D}_0 \in \bar{\mathfrak{d}}$. We put

$$\tilde{\mathfrak{d}}_1 := \{\overline{D}|_{\overline{D}_0} - \overline{C} \mid \overline{D} \in \bar{\mathfrak{d}} \setminus \{\overline{D}_0\}\}.$$

Note that $\tilde{\mathfrak{d}}_1$ is a linear system on $\overline{D}_0 \cong \mathbb{P}^1 \times \mathbb{P}^1$ consisting of $(1,1)$-curves through $\overline{P}_0, \overline{P}_6, \overline{P}_7$, and $\dim \tilde{\mathfrak{d}}_1 \geq 1$. Since the self intersection number of a $(1,1)$-curve is equal to two, $\tilde{\mathfrak{d}}_1$ has a fixed component, say $\overline{C}_1$. Since $\dim \tilde{\mathfrak{d}}_1 \geq 1$, $\overline{P}_0, \overline{P}_6, \overline{P}_7$ are on $\overline{C}_1$. This implies that the three points $\overline{P}_0, \overline{P}_6, \overline{P}_7$ are collinear in $\mathbb{P}^3$, which is a contradiction. Therefore, no five points of $\overline{P}_0, \ldots, \overline{P}_7$ are on a hyperplane of $\mathbb{P}^3$.

Suppose that three points of $\overline{P}_0, \ldots, \overline{P}_7$ are collinear. We may assume that $\overline{P}_5, \overline{P}_6, \overline{P}_7$ are on a line $\overline{L} \subset \mathbb{P}^3$. By the assumption and Lemma 5.2, we have $\overline{P}_0, \ldots, \overline{P}_4 \notin \overline{L}$. Moreover, by the above argument, we may assume that there are no hyperplanes in $\mathbb{P}^3$ through $\overline{P}_0, \ldots, \overline{P}_4$. Note that all member of $\bar{\mathfrak{d}}$ contain $\overline{L}$, and there is an irreducible member in $\bar{\mathfrak{d}}$ since $\dim \bar{\mathfrak{d}} \geq 2$.

Case 1. Suppose that there is a smooth member $\overline{D}_0 \in \bar{\mathfrak{d}}$. We put

$$\tilde{\mathfrak{d}}_2 := \{\overline{D}|_{\overline{D}_0} - \overline{L} \mid \overline{D} \in \bar{\mathfrak{d}} \setminus \{\overline{D}_0\}\}.$$

We may assume that $\overline{L}$ is a $(0,1)$-curve on $\overline{D}_0$, and that $\tilde{\mathfrak{d}}_2$ consists of $(2,1)$-curves through $\overline{P}_0, \ldots, \overline{P}_4$. The linear system $\bar{\mathfrak{d}}_2$ has a fixed component $\overline{C}_2$ since $\overline{C}^2 = 4 < 5$ for $\overline{C} \in \tilde{\mathfrak{d}}$. Since no hyperplanes in $\mathbb{P}^3$ pass through $\overline{P}_0, \ldots, \overline{P}_4$, $\overline{P}_0, \ldots, \overline{P}_4$ are on a $(2,0)$-curve on $\overline{D}_0$. This implies that five points of $\overline{P}_0, \ldots, \overline{P}_7$ are on a hyperplane, which is a contradiction.

Case 2. Suppose that all member of $\bar{\mathfrak{d}}$ are singular. Let $\overline{D}_1$ be an irreducible member of $\bar{\mathfrak{d}}$. Let $\Sigma_2 \to \overline{D}_1$ be the blowing-up at the singular point of $\overline{D}_1$, and $\sigma : \Sigma_2 \to \mathbb{P}^3$ be the composition of the blowing-up $\Sigma_2 \to \overline{D}_1$ and the inclusion $\overline{D}_1 \subset \mathbb{P}^3$. We put $F \subset \Sigma_2$ as the strict transformation of $\overline{L}$, and

$$\tilde{\mathfrak{d}}_3 := \{\sigma^*\overline{D} - F \mid \overline{D} \in \bar{\mathfrak{d}} \setminus \{\overline{D}_1\}\}.$$

Note that $\tilde{\mathfrak{d}}_3$ consists of curves linearly equivalent to $3F + 2\,S_0$ and passes through $\sigma^{-1}(\{\overline{P}_0, \ldots, \overline{P}_4\})$, where S_0 is the section of Σ_2 with $S_0^2 = -2$. Since $(3\,F + 2\,S_0)^2 = 4$, $\tilde{\mathfrak{d}}_3$ has a fixed component. Let C be an irreducible fixed component of $\tilde{\mathfrak{d}}_3$. By $\dim \tilde{\mathfrak{d}}_3 \geq 1$ and [10, V Corollary 2.18], C is linearly equivalent to F or $2\,F + S_0$. If C linearly equivalent to $2\,F + S_0$, then $\sigma^{-1}(\{\overline{P}_0, \ldots, \overline{P}_4\}) \subset C$ since $\dim \tilde{\mathfrak{d}} \geq 1$, hence $\overline{P}_0, \ldots, \overline{P}_4$ are on a hyperplane by Lemma 4.8, which is a contradiction. If C is linearly equivalent to F, then C through at least two points of $\sigma^{-1}(\{\overline{P}_0, \ldots, \overline{P}_4\})$, say $\sigma^{-1}(\overline{P}_3)$ and $\sigma^{-1}(\overline{P}_4)$. This implies that $\overline{P}_3, \ldots, \overline{P}_7$ are on

a hyperplane, which is a contradiction. Hence, no three of $\overline{P}_0, \dots, \overline{P}_7$ are collinear. Thus condition (i) holds. □

6. Examples

In this section, we give examples of irreducible 6 and 7-nodal sextic curves. Consequently, we have examples of Zariski pairs. We first explain a method of construction of a non-splitting sextic curve with respect to a contact conic.

A method of construction of a non-splitting sextic. Let $\overline{P}_0, \dots, \overline{P}_5$ be six points of $\mathbb{P}^3$ in general position, and let $\bar{\mathfrak{d}}$ be the linear system $|2\overline{H} - \overline{P}_0 - \cdots - \overline{P}_5|$ on $\mathbb{P}^3$, where $\overline{H}$ is a hyperplane. Note that $\dim \bar{\mathfrak{d}} = 3$. We consider the rational map $\Phi_{\bar{\mathfrak{d}}} : \mathbb{P}^3 \dashrightarrow \mathbb{P}^3$ given by $\bar{\mathfrak{d}}$. Let $\sigma : \widetilde{\mathbb{P}}^3 \to \mathbb{P}^3$ be the blowing-up at the six points $\overline{P}_0, \dots, \overline{P}_5$. Then $\Phi_{\bar{\mathfrak{d}}}$ induces a generically finite morphism of degree two $\widetilde{\Phi}_{\bar{\mathfrak{d}}} : \widetilde{\mathbb{P}}^3 \to \mathbb{P}^3$. The pull-back of a general quadric surface in $\mathbb{P}^3$ by $\widetilde{\Phi}_{\bar{\mathfrak{d}}}$ gives an irreducible quartic surface in $\mathbb{P}^3$ with six nodes at $\overline{P}_0, \dots, \overline{P}_5$. If $\overline{D}_0 \subset \mathbb{P}^3$ is a certain quadric cone, then the image of $\widetilde{\Phi}_{\bar{\mathfrak{d}}}^* \overline{D}_0$ by σ is a syzygetic quartic surface. If we chose certain smooth conics $\overline{D}_1, \overline{D}_2 \subset \mathbb{P}^3$ tangent to the branch locus of $\widetilde{\Phi}_{\bar{\mathfrak{d}}}$ at one and two points, respectively, then $X_1 := \sigma(\widetilde{\Phi}_{\bar{\mathfrak{d}}}^* \overline{D}_1)$ and $X_2 := \sigma(\widetilde{\Phi}_{\bar{\mathfrak{d}}}^* \overline{D}_2)$ are asyzygetic quartic surfaces with seven and eight nodes, respectively. In general, X_1 and X_2 give non-splitting sextic curves Γ_{X_1} and Γ_{X_2} with respect to Δ_{X_1} and Δ_{X_2}, respectively.

We construct the non-splitting sextic curves in Example 6.4 and 6.9 by the above method. However, we omit to describe the morphism $\Phi_{\bar{\mathfrak{d}}}$ and smooth quadric surfaces $\overline{D}_1$, $\overline{D}_2$ explicitly.

Let $\Delta \subset \mathbb{P}^2$ be a smooth conic. Let $(s : t)$ and $(u : v)$ be systems of homogeneous coordinates of $\mathbb{P}^1$, and let $(x : y : z)$ be one of $\mathbb{P}^2$. After certain projective transformation, we may assume that Δ is given by $\delta_2 = 0$, where $\delta_2 = z^2 - 4\,xy$, and the double cover $\pi_\Delta : \mathbb{P}^1 \times \mathbb{P}^1 \to \mathbb{P}^2$ is described as $\pi_\Delta(s : t, u : v) = (su : tv : sv + tu)$.

Remark 6.1. Let Γ be a r-nodal sextic curve for a positive integer $r \leq 7$. If Γ is reducible, then Γ consists of a line and an irreducible curve of degree 5 by Bézout's theorem. Conversely, if Γ is irreducible, then no 5 nodes of Γ are collinear by Bézout's theorem. Hence Γ is irreducible if and only if no 5 nodes of Γ are collinear.

6.1. 6-nodal sextics.

Let Γ_6 be a 6-nodal sextic curve on $\mathbb{P}^2$ such that Δ is a contact-conic of Γ_6. By Corollary 2.5, Γ_6 is either a splitting curve of type $(3, 3)$ or non-splitting curve with respect to Δ.

Example 6.2. Let $\Gamma_6 \subset \mathbb{P}^2$ be a splitting 6-nodal sextic curve with respect to Δ. From the proof of Theorem 2.4, Γ_6 is given by $c_3^2 - \delta_2\, c_2^2 = 0$ for some $c_i \in H^0(\mathbb{P}^2, \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^2}(i))$.

For example, if $c_2 = xy + yz + zx$ and $c_3 = x^3 + y^3 + z^3$, then Γ_6 is given by

$$(x^3 + y^3 + z^3)^2 - (z^2 - 4\,xy)(xy + yz + zx)^2 = 0,$$

and Γ_6 is a 6-nodal sextic curve. The nodes of Γ_6 are $(\alpha_i : -\alpha_i^5 - 2\,\alpha_i^4 - \alpha_i^3 - 3\,\alpha_i - 1 : 1)$ $(i = 1, \dots, 6)$, where α_i are the roots of $\alpha^6 + 3\,\alpha^5 + 3\,\alpha^4 + \alpha^3 + 3\,\alpha^2 + 3\,\alpha + 1 = 0$. Note that the 6 nodes of Γ_6 are intersection of smooth conic and cubic given by

$$x^3 + y^3 + z^3 = xy + yz + zx = 0.$$

By Remark 6.1, Γ_6 is irreducible.

Example 6.3. Let $L_1, \ldots, L_4 \subset \mathbb{P}^2$ be general lines given by equations $l_i = 0$, and let C_3 be a cubic curve given by $c_3 = 0$. If the 6-nodes $P_1, \ldots, P_6$ of $L_1 + \cdots + L_4$ are not on Δ and C_3 passes through $P_1, \ldots, P_6$, then the sextic curve Γ_6' given by $c_3^2 - \delta_2\, l_1\, l_2\, l_3\, l_4 = 0$ has 6 nodes at $P_1, \ldots, P_6$.

For example, if $l_1 = z$, $l_2 = x - y$, $l_3 = 2\,x - y$, $l_4 = x + y - 2\,z$ and $c_3 = 2\,x^3 - x^2\,y + 3\,x^2z - 2\,xy^2 - 4\,xz^2 + y^3 + yz^2$, then Γ_6' is given by

$$(2\,x^3 - x^2y + 3\,x^2z - 2\,xy^2 - 4\,xz^2 + y^3 + yz^2)^2 - z(x-y)(2\,x-y)(x+y-2\,z)(z^2 - 4\,xy) = 0,$$

and Γ_6' is a 6-nodal sextic curve. The nodes of Γ_6' are $(1:1:0), (1:2:0), (1:-1:0), (0:0:1), (1:1:1), (2:4:3)$. By Theorem 2.4, Γ_6' is a non-splitting curve with respect to Δ since the 6 nodes of Γ_6' are not on a conic. Moreover, Γ_6' is irreducible since no 5 nodes of Γ_6' are collinear.

The following example is a non-splitting 6-nodal sextic curve with respect to Δ, whose nodes are in general position.

Example 6.4. Put c_3'' and c_4'' as follows;

$$\begin{aligned} c_3'' &= 3328\,x^3 + 1392\,x^2y - 672\,x^2z + 180\,xy^2 \\ &\quad -516\,xyz - 180\,xz^2 + 10\,y^3 - 33\,y^2z - 45\,yz^2 \\ c_4'' &= 10496\,x^4 + 6272\,x^3y - 2528\,x^3z + 1200\,x^2y^2 - 912\,x^2yz + 1176\,x^2z^2 \\ &\quad +80\,xy^3 - 90\,xy^2z + 246\,xyz^2 + 2\,y^4 - 5\,y^3z + 15\,y^2z^2 \end{aligned}$$

Let Γ_6'' be the sextic curve given by the following equation;

$$(c_3'')^2 - 432\,\delta_2 c_4'' = 0$$

Then Γ_6'' is a 6-nodal curve with a simple contact conic Δ. The nodes of Γ_6'' are $(0:0:1), (0:3:2), (-1:4:0), (-1:10:6), (-1:16:8), (-3:36:38)$. Hence Γ_6'' is irreducible. It easy to see that there are no conic passing through the 6 nodes of Γ_6''. Hence Γ_6'' is non-splitting curve with respect to Δ by Theorem 2.4.

We have an example of Zariski pair.

Theorem 6.5. *Let Γ_6, Γ_6' and Γ_6'' be the 6-nodal sextics in Example 6.2, 6.3 and 6.4, respectively. Then the pairs $(\Gamma_6 + \Delta, \Gamma_6' + \Delta)$ and $(\Gamma_6 + \Delta, \Gamma_6'' + \Delta)$ are Zariski pairs.*

Remark 6.6. It is not known whether $(\Gamma_6' + \Delta, \Gamma_6'' + \Delta)$ is a Zariski pair, or not.

6.2. **7-nodal sextics.** The genus of a 7-nodal sextic curve is equal to 3. Hence all 7-nodal sextic curve are not splitting curves of type $(1, 5)$ with respect to any contact conic.

Example 6.7. We put

$$\begin{aligned} c_2 &= z^2 - 4\,xy, \\ c_3 &= y^2z - 3\,xyz + z^3 - x^2z, \\ c_4 &= \left(z^2 - xy - y^2 + x^2\right)^2. \end{aligned}$$

Let Γ_7 and Δ be the sextic curve and the conic given by $c_3^2 - c_2c_4 = 0$ and $c_2 = 0$, respectively. Then Γ_7 is a 7-nodal sextic with a simple contact conic Δ, and the 7 nodes of Γ_7 are $(0:0:1)$, $(\alpha_i : 2\alpha_i^3 + \alpha_i : 1)$ and $(\beta_j : 1 : 0)$ for $i = 1, \ldots, 4$ and $j = 1, 2$, where α_i and β_j are roots of the equations $4\alpha^4 + 2\alpha^2 - 1 = 0$ and

$\beta^2 - \beta - 1 = 0$, respectively. The 6 nodes $(\alpha_i : 2\alpha_i^3 + \alpha_i : 1)$ and $(\beta_j : 1 : 0)$ are on a smooth conic $z^2 - xy - y^2 + x^2 = 0$, hence Γ_7 is irreducible. By Theorem 2.4, Γ_7 is a splitting curve of type $(3, 3)$ with respect to Δ.

Example 6.8. We put

$$\begin{aligned} f_1 &= xw - y^2 + z^2, \\ f_2 &= yw - x^2 + z^2, \\ f_3 &= zw - x^2 + y^2. \end{aligned}$$

Then $f_3^2 - 4\, f_1 f_2 = 0$ defines a syzygetic quartic surface X in $\mathbb{P}^3$ with 8 nodes at $(0 : 0 : 0 : 1)$, $(0 : 1 : 1 : -1)$, $(-1 : 0 : 1 : 1)$, $(1 : 1 : 0 : 1)$, $(1 : 1 : 1 : 0)$, $(-1 : 1 : 1 : 0)$, $(1 : -1 : 1 : 0)$, $(1 : 1 : -1 : 0)$. We have the 7-nodal sextic curve Γ_X with the simple contact conic Δ_X from the projection $X \dashrightarrow \mathbb{P}^2$ with center $(0 : 0 : 0 : 1)$. Since the 8 nodes of X are in general position, Γ_X is irreducible. By Theorem 5.3, Γ_X is a splitting curve of type $(2, 4)$ with respect to Δ_X.

Example 6.9. We put

$$\begin{aligned} c_2' &= -61\, x^2 + 20\, xy + 4\, xz + 4\, y^2 - 4\, yz + z^2, \\ c_3' &= -13\, x^2 y + 168\, x^2 z - 74\, xyz - 8\, xz^2 - 8\, y^2 z + 7\, yz^2, \\ c_4' &= x^2 y^2 + 16\, x^2 yz - 112\, x^2 z^2 - 4\, xy^2 z + 64\, xyz^2 - y^2 z^2. \end{aligned}$$

Let Γ_7' and Δ' be the sextic curve and conic defined by ${c_3'}^2 - 4c_2'c_4' = 0$ and $c_2' = 0$, respectively. The sextic curve Γ_7' is a 7-nodal sextic with the simple contact conic Δ'. The 7 nodes of Γ_7' are $(0 : 0 : 1)$, $(0 : 1 : 0)$, $(1 : 0 : 0)$, $(1 : 1 : 1)$, $(1 : -2 : 1)$, $(-1 : 6 : 3)$, $(1 : 2 : -3)$. Hence Γ_7' is irreducible. It is easy to see that there are no conics passing through 6 points of the 7 nodes of Γ_7'. Hence Γ_7' is not a splitting curve of type $(3, 3)$ with respect to Δ' by Theorem 2.4. Moreover, we can check by direct computation that the dimension of the linear system consisting of quartic curves passing through the 7 nodes and 6 tangent points of Γ_7' and Δ' is equal to 1. Thus Γ_7' is not a splitting curve of type $(2, 4)$ with respect to Δ'. Therefore, Γ_7' is a non-splitting curve with respect to Δ'.

We have an example of Zariski 3-plet.

Theorem 6.10. *Let $\Gamma_7 + \Delta$, $\Gamma_X + \Delta_X$ and $\Gamma_7' + \Delta'$ be the curves of Example 6.7, 6.8 and 6.9, respectively. Then the 3-plet $(\Gamma_7 + \Delta, \Gamma_X, \Delta_X, \Gamma_7' + \Delta')$ is a Zariski 3-plet.*

References

[1] E. Artal Bartolo, *Sur les couples de Zariski*, J. Algebraic Geom. **3** (1994), 223—247.

[2] E. Artal Bartolo, J. Carmona, J.I. Cogollido, *Braid monodromy and topology of plane curves*, Duke Math. J. **118** (2003), no.2, 261–278.

[3] E. Artal-Bartolo, J.I. Cogolludo, H. Tokunega, *A survey on Zariski pairs*, Algebraic geometry in East Asia, Hanoi 2005, Adv. Pure Math., vol. **50**, Math. Soc. Japan, Tokyo, 2008, 1–100.

[4] E. Artal-Bartolo, H. Tokunaga, *Zariski k-plets of rational curve arrangments and dihedral covers*, Topol. Appl. **142** (2004), 227–233.

[5] S. Bannai, *A note on splitting curves of plane quartics and multi-sections of rational elliptic surfaces*, Topology Appl. **202** (2016), 428–439.

[6] A. Coble, *Algebraic geometry and theta functions*, volume 10 of *American Mathematical Society Colloquium Publications*, American Mathematical Society, Providence, R.I., 1982, Reprint of the 1929 edition.
[7] A. Degtyarëv, *On deformations of singular plane sextics*, J. Algebraic Geom. **17** (2008), no. 1, 101–135.
[8] A. Degtyarëv, *On the Artal–Carmona–Cogolludo construction*, J. Knot Theory Ramification **23** (2014), no. 5, 1450028, 35 pp.
[9] B. Guerville-Ballé, J.-B. Meilhan, *A linking invariant for algebraic curves*, Available at arXiv:1602.04916.
[10] R. Hartshorne, *Algebraic Geometry*, Grad. Text in Math. **52**, Springer-Verlag, New York (1977).
[11] C.M. Jessop, *Quartic surfaces with singular points*, Cambridge University Press, (1916)
[12] M. Oka, *Symmetirc plane curves with nodes and cusps*, J. Math. Soc. Japan **44** (1992), no.3, 349–357.
[13] I. Shimada, *Lattice Zariski k-ples of plane sextic curves and Z-splitting curves for double plane sextics*, Mich. Math. J. **59** (2010), 621–665.
[14] T. Shirane, *A note on splitting numbers for Galois covers and π_1-equivalent Zariski k-plets*, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc., to appear.
[15] H. Sumihiro, *Elementary Transformations of Algebraic Vector Bundles*, Algebraic and Topological Theories (1985), 305–327, Kinokuniya.
[16] H. Tokunaga, *Geometry of irreducible plane quartics and their quadratic residue conics*, J. Singul. **2** (2010), 170–190.
[17] H. Tokunaga, *A note on quadratic residue curves on rational ruled surfaces*, Galois–Teichm´uller theory and arithmetic geometry, 565–577, Adv. Stud. Pure Math. **63**, Math. soc. Japan, Tokyo, 2012.
[18] O. Zariski, *On the problem of existence of algebraic functions of two variables possessing a given branch curve*, Amer. J. Math. **51** (1929), 305–328.

Department of Natural Sciences, National Institute of Technology, Ibaraki College, 866 Nakane, Hitachinaka, Ibaraki 312-8508, Japan
E-mail address: sbannai@ge.ibaraki-ct.ac.jp

National Institute of Technology, Ube College, 2-14-1 Tokiwadai, Ube, Yamaguchi 755-8555, Japan
E-mail address: tshirane@ube-k.ac.jp